

of the United States in favor of a Federal-State plan of establishing and developing a national system of airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Mohammed Kubba, President of the Iraqi Chamber of Deputies, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in regard to the attitude France displays at the present time to influence small nations contrary to the principles of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

##### Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (H. R. 3292) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. E. Butler, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

734. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Corsicana Chamber of Commerce, Corsicana, Tex., favoring H. R. 538; to the Committee on Agriculture.

735. Also, petition of Retail Merchants Association of Waxahachie, Tex., suggesting amendments to the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

736. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition sponsored by the National Maritime Union in support of H. R. 2346, the merchant seamen's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

737. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of various citizens of the State of New York, favoring enactment of H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

738. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Lompoc Filipino Association of Lompoc, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to securing favorable enactment of legislation to allow Filipinos to become American citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art sifting out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat, before whom the long travail of the centuries is wrought out, who hast ushered us into this strange world where no good thing comes save as we fulfill the conditions of its coming, strengthen us for the high enterprise of building here a more decent world, where Thy children may dwell in plenty and fraternity and liberty.

Though the road to peace in our time and for our children's children be tedious and toilsome, still lead us on, following the gleam of Thy guidance, with clean hands and pure hearts, worthy of the trust the Nation has committed to our hands. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading

XCI—310

of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 21, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Thursday last, it was arranged that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] should have the floor at the opening of the session today. Will the Senator from New York defer his remarks so that the Chair may lay before the Senate and have read a message from the President of the United States?

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

The Congress has repeatedly manifested interest in an orderly transition from war to peace. It has legislated extensively on the subject, with foresight and wisdom.

I wish to draw the attention of the Congress to one aspect of that transition for which adequate provision has not as yet been made. I refer to the conversion of the executive branch of the Government.

Immediately after the declaration of war, the Congress in title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, empowered the President to make necessary adjustments in the organization of the executive branch with respect to those matters which relate to the conduct of the present war. This authority has been extremely valuable in furthering the prosecution of the war. It is difficult to conceive how the executive agencies could have been kept continuously attuned to the needs of the war without legislation of this type.

The First War Powers Act expires by its own terms 6 months after the termination of the present war. Pending that time, title I will be of very substantial further value in enabling the President to make such additional temporary improvements in the organization of the Government as are currently required for the more effective conduct of the war.

However, further legislative action is required in the near future, because the First War Powers Act is temporary and because, as matters now stand, every step taken under title I will automatically revert, upon the termination of the title, to the preexisting status.

Such automatic reversion is not workable. I think that the Congress has recognized that fact, particularly in certain provisions of section 101 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. In some instances it will be necessary to delay reversion beyond the period now provided by law or to stay it permanently. In other instances it will be necessary to modify actions heretofore taken under title I and to continue the

resulting arrangement beyond the date of expiration of the title. Automatic reversion will result in the reestablishment of some agencies that should not be reestablished. Some adjustments of a permanent character need to be made, as exemplified by the current proposal before the Congress with respect to the subsidiary corporations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Some improvements heretofore made in the Government under the First War Powers Act, as exemplified by the reorganization of the Army under Executive Order No. 9082, should not be allowed to revert automatically or at an inopportune time.

I believe it is realized by everyone—in view of the very large number of matters involved and the expedition required in their disposition—that the problems I have mentioned will not be met satisfactorily unless the Congress provides for them along the general lines indicated in this message.

Quite aside from the disposition of the war organization of the Government, other adjustments need to be made currently and continuously in the Government establishment. From my experience in the Congress, and from a review of the pertinent developments for a period of 40 years preceding that experience, I know it to be a positive fact that, by and large, the Congress cannot deal effectively with numerous organizational problems on an individual-item basis. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with expressions of Members of the Congress, themselves, to this effect. Yet, it is imperative that these matters be dealt with continuously if the Government structure is to be reasonably wieldy and manageable, and be responsive to proper direction by the Congress and the President on behalf of the people of this country. The question is one that goes directly to the adequacy and effectiveness of our Government as an instrument of democracy.

Suitable reshaping of those parts of the executive branch of the Government which require it from time to time is necessary and desirable from every point of view. A well-organized executive branch will be more efficient than a poorly organized one. It will help materially in making manageable the Government of this great Nation. A number of my predecessors have urged the Congress to take steps to make the executive branch more businesslike and efficient. I welcome and urge the cooperation of Congress to the end that these objectives may be attained.

Experience has demonstrated that if substantial progress is to be made in these regards, it must be done through action initiated or taken by the President. The results achieved under the Economy Act—1932—as amended, the Reorganization Act of 1939, and title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, testify to the value of Presidential initiative in this field.

Congressional criticisms are heard, not infrequently, concerning deficiencies in the executive branch of the Government. I should be less than frank if I failed to point out that the Congress cannot consistently advance such criticisms and at the same time deny the President

the means of removing the causes at the root of such criticisms.

Accordingly, I ask the Congress to enact legislation which will make it possible to do what we all know needs to be done continuously and expeditiously with respect to improving the organization of the executive branch of the Government. In order that the purposes which I have in mind may be understood, the following features are suggested: (a) the legislation should be generally similar to the Reorganization Act of 1939, and part 2 of title I of that act should be utilized intact, (b) the legislation should be of permanent duration, (c) no agency of the executive branch should be exempted from the scope of the legislation, and (d) the legislation should be sufficiently broad and flexible to permit of any form of organizational adjustment, large or small, for which necessity may arise.

It is scarcely necessary to point out that under the foregoing arrangement (a) necessary action is facilitated because initiative is placed in the hands of the President, and (b) necessary control is reserved to the Congress since it may, by simple majority vote of the two houses, nullify any action of the President which does not meet with its approval. I think, further, that the Congress recognizes that particular arrangement as its own creation, evolved within the Congress out of vigorous efforts and debate extending over a period of 2 years and culminating in the enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Therefore, bearing in mind what the future demands of all of us, I earnestly ask the Congress to enact legislation along the foregoing lines without delay.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 24, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce jointly with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], a bill broadening the social-security program, strengthening the employment service, and extending health services and facilities. Representative DINGELL is introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1050) to provide for the national security, health, and public welfare, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WAGNER. I desire to speak on the bill just introduced by me. As the Chair has stated, unanimous consent was granted on Monday last that I might introduce the bill and make some remarks concerning it at the opening of today's session.

Mr. President, by hard work and brilliant leadership we have defeated Germany and her satellites. We shall do the

same thing to Japan. We have done—and will continue to do—a magnificent job in winning the war. We must now begin to win and preserve the peace.

#### ROLE OF SOCIAL SECURITY IN READJUSTING OUR ECONOMY

I approach the postwar problem on the basis of hard facts. As a nation we are just beginning to come to grips with the fundamental economic problems which will become increasingly more pressing with the approach of total victory.

I believe in the American system of free enterprise. I am confident that if the Congress does its part our American system of free enterprise will enter the postwar period stronger, with greater opportunities for a higher standard of living, for useful work, for production, for full employment, and with greater vistas of new markets and new products than ever before.

The help and cooperation of the Federal Government will be most needed and most effective in the first stages of postwar adjustment. But with the best of cooperation and intentions, we must recognize that full employment—such as we have had during the war—still does not solve the economic problems of widows and orphans, the aged, the sick, and disabled. Ten years of experience with the Social Security Act have demonstrated that we can insure people against the major causes of want. Social insurance has not interfered with our system of free enterprise. On the contrary, it has helped to make our system of free enterprise operate more smoothly and effectively.

#### PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

The social-security bill which I have introduced today improves and extends our social-security system. The bill incorporates the constructive suggestions of many organizations and persons, including the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Physicians Forum, the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, the National Lawyers Guild, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Nurses' Association, the National Organization for Public Health Nursing, the National Farmers Union, and the American Foundation for the Blind. Other organizations and individuals, too numerous to mention, also made constructive suggestions.

The proposals for extension of coverage and inclusion of extended disability benefits were recommended to the Congress over 6 years ago by an Advisory Council on Social Security composed of 25 leading representatives of employers, employees and the public.

The broad principles underlying the bill were endorsed in a report of the National Planning Association by 57 representatives of business, agriculture, and labor.

The objectives of particular provisions of the bill have been advocated by numerous groups and public-spirited citizens,

by life insurance companies, small businessmen, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, State public-welfare administrators, the American Association of Social Workers, and by numerous State legislatures.

Many of the provisions in the bill were recently endorsed in principle in a poll taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The social security committees of three leading life insurance associations also have come out in favor of many of the provisions of the bill.

I am authorized to say that the bill has the strong endorsement of the responsible and patriotic American labor leadership, organized in the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and of the National Farmers Union.

The health provisions of the bill have the endorsements of many persons and organizations working in medical care and related fields. Legislation providing grants for hospital construction has been endorsed by the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association and various labor, welfare, farm and other public organizations. Most of these organizations are in favor of provisions for additional Federal funds for public health and for maternal and child health activities.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill establishes on a permanent basis a national system of public employment offices, to help war workers, war veterans, and all other workers to avail themselves of job opportunities, wherever they exist throughout the entire Nation, whether in industry or on farms.

It provides protection against the major economic hazards besetting American families—the costs of medical and hospital care, and loss of income in case of unemployment, sickness, disability, retirement, or death of the breadwinner.

Coverage of the basic social insurance system is extended to about 15,000,000 persons now excluded, such as farm workers and domestic employees, seamen, employees of nonprofit institutions, and the independent farmer, professional person and small businessman.

All these changes are accomplished under a national system of social insurance, with one set of contributions, one set of records and reports, and one set of local offices for all the programs that provide cash benefits.

The bill gives the war veteran and his family wage credits for periods of service in the armed forces for every phase of this insurance protection.

Also, an improved system for Federal grants to the States for public assistance is set up on a matching basis which provides special aid to low-income States in addition to the flat 50-50 matching under present law.

#### HEALTH PROVISIONS

The bill which I have introduced includes six provisions which will make available basic health services to all the



people wherever they live and whatever their income.

First. There is a program of Federal grants and loans to the States for the construction of needed hospitals.

It should therefore be possible, over a period of years, to assure that essential hospital and related services are available in all parts of the country, especially the rural areas which are so sadly in need of these services. The most urgently needed hospitals should be built first.

Second. The present Federal grants-in-aid to the States for public health services are broadened and increased to speed up the progress of preventive and community-wide health services.

Third. The community-wide maternal and child health and welfare services, aided by Federal grants to the States, are similarly broadened and strengthened.

Fourth. Health insurance is made available to 135,000,000 persons.

All four of the provisions which I have just mentioned will greatly help to round out the health services of the Nation. By preventing sickness, disability and premature death, they will pay vast dividends in human welfare and, at the same time, reduce the costs of other parts of the social-security program. However, unless we provide a method of spreading the cost of medical and hospital care through social insurance, people will still not obtain the treatment they need.

Fifth. The funds are set aside from the social-insurance contributions to aid in the rehabilitation of persons who are disabled.

Sixth. Grants-in-aid are provided from social-insurance funds to nonprofit institutions engaging in research or in professional education.

The financial barrier to adequate hospital and medical care is the basic reason for the unequal distribution of doctors and hospitals as between urban and rural areas, and as between prosperous and underprivileged communities. It is the basic reason for the failure of low-income families to receive as much medical care as the well-to-do, although they have more sickness. It is an important cause of the shockingly high rate of rejections under selective service.

#### HEALTH INSURANCE

A health-insurance system will go a long way toward breaking down this financial barrier. Such a system will enable the people to obtain all needed medical care through small, regular prepayments based on their earnings, and will give them security against catastrophic costs for which they cannot budget individually. It will encourage doctors to settle in rural areas, and communities to construct needed hospitals and health centers, by assuring adequate incomes, equipment, and facilities for modern medical practice. It will benefit patients, doctors, and hospitals.

#### HEALTH INSURANCE IS NOT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Propagandists against health insurance shout "regimentation of doctors and patients," "lowered standards," "political" and "socialized medicine," and so on. But health insurance is not socialized medicine; it is not state medi-

cine. Health insurance is simply a method of paying medical costs in advance and in small convenient amounts.

It is simply a method of assuring a person ready access to the medical care that he or she needs by eliminating the financial barrier between the patient and doctor or the hospital. Therefore, it should be obvious that health insurance does not involve regimentation of doctors or patients. Neither do I believe that the doctors of this country will lower the standards of medical care simply because they are guaranteed payment for their services.

There are many individuals, honest and sincere in their desire for improved conditions, who nevertheless fear any change, and distrust all new social legislation. Those of us who have sponsored social legislation have faced similar opposition against many proposals for social betterment, but we have persevered and succeeded, and we have seen these new programs accepted as part of our basic system of American freedom and democracy. Over 30 years ago in the New York Legislature I fought for workmen's accident compensation and most of the arguments which are being made against health insurance were made against workmen's compensation then. Now all the States but one have workmen's compensation laws—all include medical benefits, which is health insurance for industrial accidents and disease. The time has come for us to extend the principle of health insurance to cover nonindustrial accidents and diseases as well.

The fears and doubts expressed about workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and other measures for social security have proved to be without foundation. In the future, when we have succeeded in our struggle for a comprehensive health program for the entire country, we will be able to say about health insurance, too, that present day apprehensions and misgivings were groundless.

#### FREEDOM OF CHOICE

The health insurance provisions of the bill provide that each insured person has the right to choose his own family doctor from among all doctors in the community who participate; each participating doctor has the right to accept or reject a patient, just as he does now. Every legally qualified physician and every qualified hospital has the right to participate. The same is true for groups of physicians; and the same is true for dentists. Hospitals are guaranteed protection against interference in the management of their own affairs. Physicians, dentists, and hospitals are specifically given the right to select the method by which they are to be paid for the services they furnish. Every effort has been made similarly to protect the professional position of nurses and nursing organizations. Throughout the health insurance provisions of the bill, the basic policy has been to provide medical and related services through arrangements that are worked out so that they will be satisfactory to the public and to those who furnish the services. Mutual agreements, reached through negotiations and contracts, are specified in the bill as the method to be used, and

that is the democratic way of doing things.

#### VOLUNTARY PLANS AIDED

There has been much misunderstanding about the part that voluntary hospitals, group service organizations, existing voluntary insurance or prepayment plans and similar agencies may play in the social-insurance system. Let me emphasize that our bill makes a place for them, so that they can continue their good work. All qualified hospitals, all qualified medical groups or organizations, will be able to participate in the program as organizations that will furnish services to the insured persons who choose them; they will receive fair payments for the services they furnish as insurance benefits; and they will have enlarged opportunities to be service agencies for particular groups or for their communities. This applies to service organizations created by trade unions, consumer groups, employers, nonprofit community groups, churches, fraternal associations, groups of doctors or individual doctors, medical societies, or many other kinds of sponsors, or groups of sponsors. The bill not only provides for utilizing existing service organizations, but it also encourages the creation of new ones.

The groups operating under the Blue Cross hospital insurance plans will be able to continue to act as representatives of the participating hospitals and the community groups that own or manage the hospitals, and they will have large opportunities to be important public organizations that facilitate the administration of vital parts of the insurance system. The same will be true for many other community and public organizations.

Medical service groups—private clinics, salaried staffs of hospitals, group-service plans such as the Kaiser or the Ross-Loos plan—furnishing service under the social-insurance system would be as free as they are today to select their own staffs and their own method of paying physicians and others on their staffs, irrespective of the method of payment which prevailed among the individually practicing physicians or dentists of the local area.

#### DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION

Every effort has been made to keep a fair balance in the bill between the principles of administrative responsibility and democratic administration. The administrative officers are given duties to perform and the necessary authority so that they can carry out their duties efficiently and promptly. But their authority is carefully limited through checks and balances. Limitations are carefully specified in the bill; for example, the rights of insured persons and of physicians, and hospitals, are set down. Also, the administrative officers are required to consult with a national advisory council on all important questions of policy and administration, and this council must contain representatives of both the public and those who furnish health services. Provision also is made for advisory bodies at the local level as well.

Moreover, the administration is to be decentralized to the maximum extent possible, and administration through the

States and localities is given preference and priority wherever the State and local authorities wish to take over the responsibility.

#### HIGH MEDICAL STANDARDS ENCOURAGED

High standards of medical care are protected and encouraged through incentives for the professional advancement of doctors, post-graduate study, professional education, research, and the availability—regardless of the patient's ability to pay—of consultant and specialist services, hospital and similar facilities, laboratory services and X-ray services. Provision is made for the addition of dental and home-nursing services as rapidly as practical. The bill is clear in requiring that the arrangements to provide the medical and related services shall be worked out so that they are mutually agreeable to the administrative officers and to those who agree to furnish the services.

#### FAMILY INSURANCE PROTECTION

All of the insurance provisions of the bill provide for taking into account the wife and children of each insured person. In health insurance the wife and children of an insured person are assured all of the medical services provided any insured person. Old age, disability, and unemployment insurance benefits in the bill also take into account the number of dependents. Survivors insurance benefits—that is, benefits to the family of a deceased individual—are provided, as in the present law, in relation to the number of such dependents. This is in accord not only with principles established in workmen's accident compensation laws and the 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act, but also with tested worldwide experience in social insurance.

#### THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The bill provides for a national system of unemployment insurance. The benefits provided under the present State unemployment insurance laws are completely inadequate to serve as a strong first line of defense against reconversion and postwar unemployment. The weekly maximum limits are so low that on the average, workers are paid benefits representing only about one-third of their wage loss when they become unemployed. In 1940, the last prewar year, one-half of the workers exhausted their benefits before they found another job. The disqualification provisions are becoming increasingly stringent. The coverage of these State unemployment compensation laws fails to provide any protection whatsoever to over 10,000,000 workers. The net result of all these defects was that in 1940, a fairly good year, the benefits received by workers unemployed through no fault of their own represented less than 10 percent of the total wage loss suffered in this country. The failure to pay adequate benefits is not due to any lack of funds, since the State unemployment reserves at the present time amount to six and one-half billion dollars. The fundamental cause is interstate competition, each State fearing to expose its employers to unfair competition if they are required to pay more

adequate benefits than their competitors in other States.

The disastrous effects of interstate competition can only be overcome by a national system. It is not possible to make certain under a State-by-State system that workers with the same wage loss will receive the same benefits wherever they happen to be located. Nor can a State-by-State system make certain that workers who move from one State to another will receive their benefits fully and promptly.

Nor is it possible to relieve employers operating in more than one State from the necessity of making an intolerable number of reports under a State-by-State system. A national system of unemployment insurance is the only solution to these problems.

#### THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The need for a national system of public employment offices has become more and more evident during the war years. Without national operation of these public employment offices it would have been completely impossible to mobilize the manpower of this country. During the postwar years we will have the manpower problem in reverse arising out of the tremendous geographical shifting of workers that is taking place. Our paramount manpower problem will be to facilitate the relocation of workers now in congested war-industry areas. Local public employment offices under State control could not possibly carry out this task because they are unable to appraise the entire national labor market and are not able to carry out a single coordinated Nation-wide relocation policy. But a national system of public employment offices is in a position to keep unemployment down to a minimum during the postwar period by bringing together manless jobs and jobless men wherever they exist throughout the Nation.

#### FINANCING SOCIAL SECURITY

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of 1943, like several other bills I have introduced on the subject of social security in recent years, died in the Finance Committee because social-security contributions were unfortunately called taxes in the original legislation of 1935 and under the Constitution all tax bills must originate in the House of Representatives. No general hearings on social security have been held by the Ways and Means Committee in the House for 6 years. Because of the failure of the House to take action, the Senate has been deprived of the opportunity to translate its views on social security into legislation.

As the Senate well knows, many programs which are now included under the general term "social security" are handled by various committees in the Senate. Thus, legislation relating to public employment offices, hospital construction, and health—all of which are included in the bill which I have introduced today—have been handled by the Committee on Education and Labor.

The national health bill which I introduced in 1939 provided for amending the Social Security Act to include provisions on health; this bill was handled by

the Committee on Education and Labor. As a matter of fact, there is ample precedent in the Senate for recognizing that revenue features of bills are not the sole determinant of public policy.

Right at the present time, social-insurance legislation which I have introduced jointly with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] relating to railroad retirement and unemployment insurance—including both contributions and benefits—is in the hands of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY PREMIUMS

I do not believe that social security and health legislation should be considered as a tax matter. I think that social security legislation should be handled on its merits as social legislation. Social insurance contributions are premiums for insurance protection—not general taxes for paying the expenses of Government.

Congress will undoubtedly take some action on social security this year. The contribution rate for old-age and survivors insurance is automatically scheduled to increase from 1 percent each on employers and employees to 2½ percent each. This increase is provided in existing law and will become effective January 1, 1946, unless Congress enacts specific legislation to the contrary. I strongly urge that Congress consider the benefit provisions of social security at the same time it considers the tax provisions.

#### COMPARISON WITH EXISTING CONTRIBUTION RATES

The rates of contribution specified in this bill to finance all of the insurance benefits that are provided total 8 percent, of which 4 percent is payable by employers and 4 percent by employees on wages up to \$3,600 a year. Employers are now subject to a 3 percent Federal unemployment contribution. However, because of the operation of so-called "experience rating" employers are actually paying an average of 2¼ percent for unemployment insurance. Employers are also paying a contribution of 1 percent to finance the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system which present legislation provides for being increased to 2½ percent beginning January 1, 1946. Therefore, employers generally would be paying only three-fourths of 1 percent more under this bill than they are already paying and less than they will be required to pay under existing law beginning next year.

Employees are already paying a 1 percent Federal contribution to finance the old-age and survivors insurance system (which is scheduled to go up to 2½ percent in 1946), and they are also paying contributions in four States to finance unemployment and temporary disability insurance. Therefore, employees under this bill for the most part would be paying 3 percent more than they are paying at the present time but only 1½ percent more than they are already scheduled to pay beginning next year. However, in return for this increased payment they would be receiving protection against wage loss due to temporary disability and extended disability, protection



against the cost of hospital and medical care, and increased retirement, survivors, and unemployment insurance benefits. Since employers would be paying a part of the cost of the increased protection provided, the value of this increased protection would be considerably in excess of the increased contribution which employees would pay under this bill. The workers of the country, speaking through their great national organizations, are willing to pay increased contributions for increased insurance protection. This is justified, because they will get their full money's worth in increased security.

It would have been possible, of course, to vary the proportion that employers and employees, respectively, would bear of the cost of providing each specific type of protection included in this bill. This bill, however, provides for equal sharing between employers and employees without distinction as to the specific type of risk insured.

This is not only simpler, but the principle of equal sharing is sounder for a system of social insurance, which I believe should be founded upon the basis of a mutual sharing of a risk.

#### COMPARISON WITH CONTRIBUTIONS IN PREVIOUS BILL

The fact that the total contribution rate provided in this bill is 8 percent as compared with 12 percent in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill introduced in the last Congress does not mean that any of the proposed benefits have been reduced. On the contrary, the benefits have been increased. There are two reasons for the reduction in the contribution rate. First, the proposed total unemployment insurance contribution rate has been reduced from 4 to 2 percent and, second, the combined retirement, survivors and extended disability contribution rate has been reduced from 4 to 2 percent. It has been possible to reduce the unemployment insurance contribution rate because the unemployment trust fund being built up under existing legislation has continued to grow, so that it is now much larger than it was when the previous bill was introduced. By January 1, 1946, the unemployment reserves will total about \$7,000,000,000. Therefore, there is no longer any question that there will be ample funds to finance unemployment insurance benefits during the immediate post-war period. Moreover, for the long-run, taking the assumptions as to the amount of frictional unemployment we are likely to experience with reasonably full employment in the future, a 2-percent unemployment insurance rate, instead of a 4-percent unemployment insurance rate as provided in the previous bill, will be ample to pay adequate unemployment insurance benefits.

Second. The total contribution rate to finance retirement, extended disability and survivors benefits has been reduced from 4 percent to 2 percent, in accordance with the recent act of Congress in freezing for the fourth time the existing contribution rate of 2 percent. The 2 percent rate will cover current disbursements for all these benefits for several years after the end of the war. At that time, it will be necessary either to increase the contribution rate or provide a Government subsidy to the insurance system out of general revenues.

I have long been in favor of a substantial Government contribution to the social insurance fund. The bill provides, therefore, as does the present Federal old-age and survivors insurance law, for authorizing appropriations to the trust fund out of general revenues, whenever the Congress deems necessary. I have consistently opposed in the past freezing the old-age and survivors insurance contribution at 1 percent each on the employer and on the employee because the Congress has not clearly committed itself to a long-run financial policy under the present law. Moreover, I repeatedly stated that there are difficult problems involved in providing a governmental contribution under an insurance system which covers only part of the population.

Extension of the coverage of the insurance system, and provisions for systematic financial review as specified in the present bill makes a Government contribution more equitable and makes it possible to pay the benefits under the retirement, survivors and extended disability insurance provisions with a contribution of 1 percent each on employers and employees for the next several years.

#### TRIPARTITE SYSTEM OF FINANCING

I believe that it is sound for employees and employers and the Government to share in the costs of a comprehensive social-insurance plan. Contributions by the employees are necessary and desirable to assure that benefits will be paid as a matter of right. Contributions by employers are a recognition of the employer's interest in maintaining healthy and secure employees and of taking the human factor into consideration in determining costs of production.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION

A government contribution is desirable because social insurance has a social purpose. It protects society as a whole as well as the individual and his family. Moreover, a social insurance system reduces relief costs of the Government and the general taxpayer, and a contribution out of general revenues is a recognition of the social obligation of the community to meet the needs of aged, disabled, and unemployed individuals, widows, and orphans.

I hope that as the total disbursements for retirement benefits increase because of present population trends, the Government will contribute to the insurance fund until eventually its share will represent about one-third of the total disbursements. I also hope that such governmental contributions will come from general revenues raised by progressive taxation. In this way we can assure the development of a financially sound social insurance system.

The Government, of course, must make contributions to the insurance system for the insurance protection afforded to veterans. Where benefits are provided to needy individuals or on behalf of persons already retired or disabled, it is reasonable also to expect the Government to meet these costs.

Two additional insurance benefits have been added in our present bill—dental and home nursing. It is uncertain how rapidly these additional benefits can be furnished, and the provisions of the bill are therefore very flexible. The addi-

tional costs may be small at first and may rise gradually for 5 or 10 years. These additional benefits are to be financed from general-revenue funds as needed.

The funds required for grants and loans to construct needed hospitals, for grants for public health, for maternal and child health and welfare services, and for public assistance are to be derived from general revenues, not from social insurance contributions. Since these expenditures are intended for general community-wide programs, as in the past for the same or similar programs, this is a sound method of financing.

#### REVIEW OF FINANCING BY ADVISORY COUNCIL

While I believe that the financial aspects of the bill are sound, I recognize that we cannot construct the financial set-up of social insurance for all time without frequent review and provision for possible change. To preserve this flexibility, the bill provides that the Advisory Council created under the bill study the entire problem of financing social insurance in the post-war years.

#### NECESSITY FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

Countries all over the world, large and small—Great Britain, Venezuela, Uruguay, and our neighbors, Canada and Mexico—have improved their social security legislation, even during the war. Is the United States to lag behind other nations? We should have started long ago to expand, extend, and improve our social security program. We must move forward now before it is too late.

With full employment and full production, we can have a complete and adequate social security system at a modest cost.

If we do not achieve full employment, it is all the more imperative that we have a complete and adequate social security program.

The plan embodied in this bill is an American plan—geared to the wage scales and standards of living of the individual families in various sections of the country. The plan provides for a practical program within our ability to pay.

The program is a practical one in a much higher sense. Our democracy could provide no better bulwark against the troubled times which may be ahead than to develop this dignified, all-embracing plan for social security upon which each family can build its own future by its own efforts.

Mr. President, I have prepared a summary of the provisions of the bill for the information of Senators who wish to study the bill in detail. I ask unanimous consent that this summary be included in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, this bill is not put forward as the final solution to all social-security problems. It is proposed merely as a desirable next step that can be put into operation now. As our national income increases, Congress can and should consider further improvements in the benefits. As experience is gained in the administration of the program, further simplifications can

be adopted. But we need not wait for a perfect social security plan to improve the present program.

This bill is not proposed on the assumption that social security is an end in itself. In a democracy where human values depend basically on the dignity and freedom of the individual and the family, social security is only a means toward this end.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. MURRAY, who has joined me in sponsoring this bill, is absent on public business. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a statement prepared by him on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

#### EXHIBIT A

#### SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL—THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1945

The social security bill contains 10 sections. The general outline of these 10 sections is as follows:

##### BRIEF OUTLINE OF BILL

Section 1. Short title: Social security amendments of 1945.

Sections 2 and 3. Grants and loans for construction of health facilities: Provides a 10-year program of Federal grants and loans for construction and expansion of hospitals, health centers and related facilities to be financed out of general revenues. The Federal Government will pay at least 25 percent of the cost of a project and up to 50 percent in accordance with a State's per capita income. Loans may not exceed an additional 25 percent of the cost of the project.

Section 4. Grants to States for public health services: Provides Federal grants to States from general revenues for expansion of public health services. The Federal Government will pay at least 25 percent of the amounts expended by a State and up to 75 percent in accordance with a State's per capita income.

Section 5. Grants to States for maternal and child health and welfare services: Provides Federal grants to States from general revenues for maternal and child health and welfare services. The Federal Government will pay at least 25 percent of amounts expended by a State and up to 75 percent in accordance with a State's per capita income.

Section 6. Comprehensive public assistance program: Provides for Federal grants to the States for public assistance to needy individuals—aged, blind, dependent children, or others. Federal Government will pay at least 50 percent of amounts spent by States and up to 75 percent for States in accordance with a State's per capita income.

Sections 7 and 8. A national system of public employment offices: Provides for a continuation of Federal operation of the United States Employment Service.

Section 9. National social insurance system: Consisting of health insurance, unemployment insurance, temporary disability insurance, and retirement, survivors, and extended disability insurance.

Part A. Prepaid personal health service insurance: Provides for insurance of medical care costs; not State medicine.

Part B. Unemployment and temporary disability insurance benefits: On a Federal basis. Benefits of \$5 to \$30 per week up to 26 weeks; if funds are adequate, up to 52 weeks for unemployment.

Part C. Retirement, survivors, and extended disability insurance benefits: Provides for more liberal benefits than existing law. Minimum, \$20 per month; maximum, \$120.

Part D. National social insurance trust fund: All funds invested in United States Government bonds.

Part E. Credit for military service: One hundred and sixty dollars wages credited under the insurance system for each month of military service.

Part F. Coverage provisions and definitions: Extends coverage to about 15,000,000 additional persons.

Part G. Social insurance contributions: Four percent each on employers and employees. Government contribution authorized when necessary.

Part H. General provisions: Judicial review, national advisory council and rehabilitation of disabled persons.

Section 10. Definitions.

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE: "SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1945"

#### SECTIONS 2 AND 3. GRANTS AND LOANS FOR HOSPITAL AND HEALTH CENTER CONSTRUCTION

Section 2: This section provides for a 10-year program to build, improve, and enlarge hospitals and health centers as needed, especially in rural communities, and areas where facilities are overtaxed as a consequence of the war and where the need for additional facilities is likely to continue. In order that the facilities shall be built most advantageously where they are needed, surveys are to be made by the States. A total of \$5,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated, to provide grants to the States to assist them (with their own funds) to make the surveys. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized to make such surveys in the event a State does not do so.

A total of \$950,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated over a 10-year period for construction grants and loans, of which \$50,000,000 is for the fiscal year 1946 and \$100,000,000 for each of the 9 succeeding years. The program is to be administered by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, with the assistance of the Federal Works Agency, on construction matters.

Grants, or grants and loans, may be made to States, their political subdivisions, and to nonprofit organizations for hospitals and health centers. All amounts appropriated are to be available until spent, except that balances at the end of the tenth year, and loans as they are repaid, revert to the Treasury. Loans are to be repaid within 20 years and are limited to hospitals which receive grants. The grants shall be for not less than 25 percent nor more than 50 percent of the cost of the project, exclusive of the cost of the site. Loans may not exceed 25 percent of the cost of the project.

Grants for construction projects are adjusted according to a formula specified in the bill and based upon the per capita income of each State compared to the average for the United States. The same formula applies to grants toward the cost of administering the State construction plans.

Applications for grants and loans are to be made to the Surgeon General and shall include the information necessary to establish the need for the hospital project, to show that the project is in accordance with the State construction program and is approved by the State agency, to show that the applicant needs a grant or a grant and loan, and that the hospital will be used so as to furnish services of satisfactory quality in accordance with standards prescribed by the State.

In the event a State has not developed a construction program by January 1, 1948, the Surgeon General may make State surveys of needed facilities, and may approve applications that are in accord with the results of such surveys. Prior to that date, he may not approve an application for projects in States that have no approved plan unless the application is for an urgently needed facility in a rural, semirural, or a war-distressed area, for an existing hospital that cannot continue to operate without the new project, or for a

health center approved by the State health agency.

A National Advisory Hospital Construction Council is established to advise the Surgeon General in the administration of this program, particularly with respect to standards for determining the need for additional hospital facilities, for assuring proper construction and equipment, and adequate maintenance and use. The Council is to have nine members—the Surgeon General ex officio, and eight members appointed by him after consultation with the National Advisory Medical Policy Council and with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator. The eight appointed members shall be selected from leading medical and other authorities and from among persons who are concerned with the need for hospitals in urban and rural areas. The Council is to review and to make a recommendation upon each application for grants. Specific provision is made to assure that hospitals assisted under this program will remain free from control by the Federal Government.

Section 3: This section merely provides for changing the section numbers of the Public Health Service Act because of the addition of the new title on hospital construction in that act.

#### SECTION 4. INCREASED GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

This section amends section 314 of the Public Health Service Act. The subsections concerned with grants for the venereal disease and for the tuberculosis programs are unchanged. The subsections dealing with general public health work are revised so as to strengthen the program and pledge complete Federal cooperation to the States in moving as rapidly as practicable toward the development of adequate public health services in all parts of the country. The present authorization of \$20,000,000 a year for grants to States is replaced by an authorization to appropriate a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes. Also, the annual amount available to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for demonstrations, training of personnel, and administrative expenses is increased from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 a year.

In order to receive the Federal grants the States are required to develop their own plans in accordance with their own needs, and to submit these plans for approval. They must be approved by the Surgeon General if they meet the requirements that are specified. An orderly system of arrangements is laid down, ensuring reasonable standards and systematic financial participation by the States (and by the localities cooperating under the State plans). This is the same general pattern as has been followed for public assistance since the original Social Security Act of 1935. The amounts of the grants to States are determined by an explicit formula, designed to give relatively more aid to the poorer States and relatively less to the richer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 25 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs.

#### SECTION 5. INCREASED GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES

This section amends title V of the Social Security Act relating to Federal cooperation with the States to provide health and welfare services for mothers and children. A common plan is followed in each of the three parts, dealing respectively with maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare. In order to receive Federal grants, the States are to develop their own plans, in accordance with their own needs. If these plans meet the requirements specified, they must be approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau. The requirements are those that are essential to insure reasonable standards, systematic financing and administration, and reasonably rapid extension of the



services to all parts of the States and on an adequate basis. Administration by the Federal authorities shall be in close consultation with the State authorities.

As in the case of grants for public-health work and public assistance, the Federal grants would be on a variable basis, so as to give special aid to the poorer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 25 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs, the amount in each case being determined by a specific formula written into the law. The Federal Government would be entering into full partnership with the States in providing services for mothers and children, leaving wide latitude to the States as to the scope and content of the programs.

#### SECTION 6. COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC-ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

This section provides Federal grants to States for assistance to all needy persons. It provides variable Federal grants to the States, ranging from 50 percent to 75 percent of the total expended, depending upon the State's per capita income. The higher rates apply to the States with the lower per capita incomes. The program authorizes Federal matching, on this variable grant basis, of money payments to any aged person, dependent child, blind person, or other needy individual (without the rigid maxima provided by existing law); and where so provided in an approved State plan, medical services to needy individuals, payments for the care of children in foster homes, and such services as may assist in making needy individuals self-supporting.

These Federal grants, like the similar provisions of the present law, are made out of general revenues. As under existing law, State plans must meet various requirements, including maintenance of civil-service merit standards for administrative personnel. In determining need, the State must take into consideration any other income of any individual claiming assistance except that the State may, in its discretion, not take into consideration any amounts of current income received by an individual up to \$20 per month, as the State may determine.

The bill provides that States may choose to provide assistance to the needy aged, blind and dependent children included under the present law or that States may choose to add additional groups or provide assistance to all needy persons. The limitations in the existing Federal law are removed so that States may obtain Federal funds for a wide variety of purposes designed not only to provide assistance to persons already needy but to help persons to be restored to self-support. Most States are already providing such services under existing public-welfare laws. By providing Federal financial participation toward meeting part of such costs, States will be encouraged to broaden the scope and improve the quality of such services.

In view of the fact that the proposed legislation would make additional Federal funds available to every State in the Union, it is essential that the State programs provide more adequate assistance and improved and simplified administration. The bill requires that as a condition for receiving Federal grants States must not impose as a condition of eligibility for assistance under the plan any citizenship or residence requirements. Since under the revised program the largest part of the total cost will come from Federal funds, it is reasonable that all persons in the United States who are actually determined to be needy by State agencies be given assistance irrespective of State or county residence or inability to prove citizenship. The bill also provides that as a condition for obtaining Federal funds the State public assistance plan must provide for distribution of funds so as to assure meeting in full the need of individuals throughout the State as determined in accordance with standards established by the State. This

provision would not modify the existing law which places upon the State the responsibility for determining who is a needy individual and the amount of assistance to be granted such individual. It is designed, however, to assure that needy individuals in a particular county will not be denied assistance because of the lack of adequate local financial participation by such county.

In the interests of economy and efficiency of operation the bill provides that there be one State agency and also only one local agency to administer all assistance in each locality.

The bill also provides that special consideration should be given to the special needs of individuals. The bill specifically provides that where an individual has special needs because of illness, disability, or special costs due to employment, education, or the like, such persons shall have these factors taken into account in the determination of the individual's need.

#### SECTIONS 7 AND 8. A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

SEC. 7. This section provides for an expanded and strengthened national system of public employment offices established in the Social Security Board, to assist war workers, war veterans, and all others to avail themselves of civilian employment opportunities throughout the Nation, to promote employment in private industry and on farms, and, generally, to bring together available workers and available jobs in the maximum use of the Nation's productive facilities and manpower. Among other duties, the expanded Employment Service is directed to provide facilities in cooperation with the administration of unemployment insurance.

Provision is made for the establishment of a National Advisory Employment Service Policy Council for the purpose of formulating policies, reviewing administrative operations, and discussing problems relating to the Employment Service.

Six months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, the present Employment Service and all related activities of the War Manpower Commission are transferred to the new United States Employment Service created by the bill.

SEC. 8. This section provides for the repeal of the Wagner-Peyser Act under which the Federal-State Employment Service was originally established.

#### SECTION 9. NATIONAL SOCIAL INSURANCE SYSTEM PART A. PREPAID MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE

Part A of this section provides for medical and hospital insurance.

Freedom of medical practice is carefully safeguarded. Each insured person is entitled to choose his own doctor from among all physicians or groups of physicians in the community who have voluntarily agreed to go into the insurance system. Each doctor or group of doctors is free to go in or stay out of the insurance system. These doctors who participate are free to accept or reject patients who may wish to select them as their family doctor, and the participating doctors are likewise free to choose the method through which they are to be paid from the insurance fund. Patients and doctors may change the arrangements after they have been made if they become dissatisfied. Doctors practicing as specialists, individually or in groups, would be entitled to special rates of payment if they meet professional standards for specialists. Thus, existing arrangements for choosing a doctor and obtaining medical, laboratory, or hospital care would not be disturbed.

The bill contains various provisions to assure that medical benefits will be the highest quality that can be made generally available, will promote personal relations between doctor and patient, will emphasize prevention of disease, and will be adapted to the needs and practices of the community, in both rural and urban areas.

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service—a doctor—would ad-

minister the technical and professional aspects of the program. The Surgeon General would also be authorized to work out the closest possible coordination between the medical and hospital services and the public health services of the Federal, State, and local governments.

Hospital care is limited to 60 days per year, with a possible maximum of 120 days if experience proves that the insurance fund can afford it. All qualified hospitals are eligible to participate. The Surgeon General is forbidden from exercising supervision or control over the management of hospitals that participate in the insurance system.

The Surgeon General is directed to establish a National Advisory Policy Council. Members of this advisory council would be appointed from panels of names submitted by professional and other organizations concerned with medical services, education, hospitals, etc. The advisory council must also include representatives of the public.

Specific provision is included for hearings and appeals on any disputed issues between practitioners, hospitals, and insured persons. Specific provision is made for the judicial review of any disputed issues arising under the plan.

The Surgeon General is directed to decentralize the administration of the program by giving priority and preference to the use of existing State and local agencies. Where no such arrangements have been made, the Surgeon General is directed to establish committees in each locality to aid in the administration of the program and to assure that the program will be adapted to local needs. Such committees shall include representatives of the insured population, doctors, hospitals, other agencies furnishing service under the program, and other persons informed on the need for, or provision of, health benefits. The Surgeon General is authorized to negotiate cooperative working arrangements with Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and with private groups or individuals, to provide the benefits by utilizing their services and facilities on payment of fair and reasonable compensation. The health insurance benefits may be furnished to noninsured persons such as needy persons receiving public assistance, if appropriate arrangements are made to pay on their behalf the cost of services furnished to them.

The Surgeon General and the Social Security Board are directed to make studies and to report to Congress on dental, nursing, or other services not provided under the insurance system, and on services and facilities needed for the care of the chronic sick and for persons afflicted with mental diseases.

The Surgeon General is directed, with the advice of the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies engaging in research or in undergraduate or postgraduate professional education. Such grants would be made for projects showing promise of making valuable contributions to the education, and training of persons in furnishing health insurance benefits, or of making valuable contributions, with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of disease or disability. Provision is made for giving preference to educational projects for returning servicemen seeking postgraduate education or training in medical, dental, and related fields. The sum available each year for such grants-in-aid would be 1 percent of the total expended for all social-insurance benefits exclusive of unemployment insurance or 2 percent of the amount expended for health insurance, whichever is less.

#### PART B. UNEMPLOYMENT AND TEMPORARY DISABILITY INSURANCE

Part B establishes a new Federal unemployment insurance system administered by the Social Security Board. Unemployment benefits are payable for 26 weeks. If the funds available are deemed adequate, the duration of benefits may be extended to a

maximum total of 52 weeks, but the Board may require attendance at a training course as a condition for receiving such extended benefits. Weekly benefits are payable from \$5 to \$20 per week for single individuals. As in the case of old-age insurance, benefits are increased for workers with dependents. The maximum benefit payable is \$30 per week in contrast to most existing State laws in which the maximum is between \$15 and \$20 per week. The waiting period is 1 week. Benefits will be paid to eligible persons upon registration and continued reporting for work at the public employment office or at training courses approved by the Board. Failure to report or to accept suitable work when offered is a ground for disqualification.

Insured workers who are certified as temporarily disabled, through illness or injury, are likewise eligible for the same benefits, after 1 week's waiting period, for a maximum duration of 26 weeks. In addition to the maximum duration for disability benefits, married women workers are entitled to weekly benefits, in the same amounts, for 12 weeks of maternity leave.

TABLE 1.—Illustrative weekly unemployment and temporary disability insurance benefits under the bill

Average weekly wage	Worker	Worker and wife	Worker, wife, and 1 child	Worker, wife, and 2 or more children
\$10 or less.....	\$5	\$6.50	\$7.50	\$8
\$20.....	10	13.00	15.00	16
\$30.....	15	19.50	22.50	24
\$40 or more.....	20	26.00	30.00	30

#### PART C. RETIREMENT, SURVIVORS AND EXTENDED DISABILITY INSURANCE

Under this part of the bill, the present Federal old-age and survivors insurance system is broadened to include monthly cash benefits where the insured worker is totally disabled for 6 months or more before he reaches the retirement age. These benefits would be equal to those paid under old-age insurance, and in the same way would be increased for the worker who has a dependent wife, dependent children, or dependent parents.

Effective January 1, 1946, the bill changes the benefit formula and the method for calculating an individual's average wage. In addition, the maximum family insurance benefit is increased from \$85 under present law, to \$120. The minimum benefit also is increased from \$10 under present law to \$20 for a single worker and \$30 for a worker with a dependent wife age 60 or over. Thus the bill provides an assured minimum of \$30 a month for an insured couple, and higher payments up to a maximum of 80 percent of average wages or \$120, whichever is smaller, the exact amount depending on prior wages and years of employment. The same minimum and maximum provisions would apply in the case of extended disability.

TABLE 2.—Illustrative monthly old-age retirement or extended disability benefits under the bill

Number of years of coverage	Insured person	Insured person and wife	Insured person, wife, and 1 child	Insured person, wife, and 2 children
Average monthly wage \$100				
10 years' coverage.....	\$36.00	\$54.00	\$72.00	\$80.00
20 years' coverage.....	39.00	58.50	78.00	80.00
30 years' coverage.....	43.00	64.50	80.00	80.00
40 years' coverage.....	46.00	69.00	80.00	80.00
Average monthly wage \$200				
10 years' coverage.....	\$47.00	\$70.50	\$94.00	\$117.50
20 years' coverage.....	51.00	76.50	102.00	120.00
30 years' coverage.....	56.00	84.00	112.00	120.00
40 years' coverage.....	60.00	90.00	120.00	120.00

The bill also reduces from 65 to 60 years the age when women become eligible for retirement and widow's benefits.

Upon the death of any insured worker, the bill provides for a lump-sum death payment to the surviving spouse equal to six times the primary old-age benefit of that worker. If there is no surviving spouse, this lump-sum benefit will be paid to any other person equitably entitled, to the extent that he has paid the burial expenses of the deceased worker.

TABLE 3.—Illustrative monthly survivors benefits under the bill

Number of years of coverage	Widow	Widow and 1 child	Widow and 2 children	2 parents
Average monthly wage \$100				
10 years' coverage.....	\$27.00	\$45.00	\$80.00	\$36.00
20 years' coverage.....	29.25	48.75	80.00	39.00
30 years' coverage.....	32.25	53.75	80.00	43.00
40 years' coverage.....	34.50	57.50	80.00	46.00
Average monthly wage \$200				
10 years' coverage.....	\$35.25	\$58.75	\$105.75	\$47.00
20 years' coverage.....	38.25	63.75	114.75	51.00
30 years' coverage.....	42.00	70.00	120.00	56.00
40 years' coverage.....	45.00	75.00	120.00	60.00

The bill also changes the provisions for determining the insured status of an individual so that all persons engaged in governmental arsenals, or any other type of war work not covered by the social-insurance system, will not have the period prior to 1946 count against them in determining their eligibility for retirement, survivors, and extended disability insurance benefits.

This section of the bill also liberalizes the existing provision of law which permits an individual to earn up to \$15 per month and still draw his insurance benefit. The amended provision increases this amount to \$25 per month. For blind persons this amount is increased to \$50 per month.

#### PART D. TRUST FUND

The bill creates a social insurance trust fund to which is transferred existing funds credited to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. The bill provides that all contributions are to be deposited directly in the trust fund. A board of trustees, composed as at present of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Social Security Board, is established to hold the trust fund and make annual reports to Congress on the benefit payments and the status of the fund. The Secretary of the Treasury, as managing trustee, is authorized to invest the trust fund in United States bonds.

Provision is made, as under the present Federal old-age and survivors insurance law, for authorizing appropriations to the trust fund, out of general revenues, whenever the Congress deems necessary. Appropriations would be required to pay the cost of covering the insurance rights of war veterans, the cost of medical and hospital benefits provided to old-age, survivors, disabled beneficiaries, and for meeting the costs of medical and hospital benefits to needy persons for whom arrangements are made under section 209, and for dental and home-nursing benefits.

These contributions provided in the bill will be sufficient to pay all insurance benefits for several years after the end of the war, depending primarily upon employment conditions. Before that time it will be necessary to decide whether the contributions should be increased or the Government should contribute to the insurance system out of general revenues, or some combination of both.

#### PART E. CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE

The bill gives wage credits of \$160 per month to men and women in the armed forces for the entire period of their military service. The individual war veteran and his family would thus be insured for all social-insurance benefits provided in the bill, without deductions from his pay during military service. The cost of this protection is borne by the Federal Government out of general revenue.

#### PART F. COVERAGE OF INSURANCE SYSTEM

This section extends coverage to all persons in industry and commerce (except railroad workers) under the entire social insurance system, including agricultural and domestic workers, seamen, and employees of nonprofit institutions (except ministers and members of religious orders). Self-employed persons (small businessmen, farmers, and professional persons) are covered under all insurance programs except unemployment and temporary disability insurance.

Present or future employees of State or local governments who are covered by existing pension systems specifically continue to be exempt, as under the present law. Employees of State or local governments who are not under existing pension systems may be covered (under retirement, survivors, extended disability, and medical insurance) by a voluntary compact between the Social Security Board and the appropriate State or local governmental unit.

Federal employees are not covered by the bill except hourly employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### PART G. SOCIAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS

The bill provides for insurance contributions of 4 percent on employees and 4 percent on employers. The following table shows the allocation of contributions for each of the four insurance programs.

TABLE 4.—Proposed social-insurance contributions under the bill

[As a percent of pay roll]

Program	Em- ployer	Em- ployee	Total
1. Retirement, survivors' and extended disability insurance.....	Percent 1.0	Percent 1.0	Percent 2.0
2. Medical care and hospitalization insurance.....	1.5	1.5	3.0
3. Unemployment insurance.....	1.0	1.0	2.0
4. Temporary disability insurance.....	.5	.5	1.0
Total contributions.....	4.0	4.0	8.0

Since the self-employed and employees of States and localities are not covered for unemployment and temporary disability insurance, but are covered only for retirement, survivors and extended disability benefits (for which 2 percent is charged) and medical care and hospitalization insurance (3 percent), their total contribution is 5 percent; in the case of the employees of States and localities (who may be covered on an optional basis if not already covered by their own pension systems) half of this contribution is payable by their employer.

#### PART H.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The bill establishes a National Social Security Advisory Council, representing employers, employees, and the general public, to formulate policies on legislation and administration, and to investigate and make recommendations concerning coverage of various groups; the adequacy of benefits in relation to wage levels, cost of living, and other factors; methods of financing of the insurance system, and methods of providing incentives to beneficiaries for rehabilitation and employment.

The Social Security Board is directed to make provision, after consultation with the



the Surgeon General and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, for determination and certification of disability, and for the rehabilitation (medical and vocational) of disabled persons who are entitled to disability benefits and who may be assisted by such services so that they can return to gainful work. For these rehabilitation services, a sum equal to 2 percent of disability benefits is set aside from the trust fund.

#### SECTION 10. DEFINITIONS

Section 10 contains general definitions.

#### EXHIBIT B

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA, ON INTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL OF 1945

I am proud to have the opportunity of joining with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] in introducing in the Senate of the United States a bill designed to make our limited system of social security comprehensive and to extend it to practically all of our population.

The Congress already has before it, in the full employment bill, a plan to stabilize our economy and to control those violent fluctuations that in the past have contributed greatly to international evils. Today, Senator WAGNER and I lay before the Congress a plan to bring a full measure of social security to our people. By enacting this bill, the Congress will be giving reality to a large part of the economic bill of rights that our people need to protect them against the perils of the future; and the Congress will take an important and practical step toward achieving all the "four freedoms" by assuring to the American people freedom from want.

There is widespread demand for a comprehensive system of social security. This has been shown, again and again, by polls of public opinion. Both political parties are committed to it.

In the minds of the American people, the results that can be achieved by a comprehensive system of social security are among the main goals of the war. The social and economic problems of our modern industrial life become greater, not smaller; they may be expected to be extremely serious in the years ahead. We must have orderly, secure, and adequate plans to meet the uncertainties of our industrial life. We must act, and act rapidly, if our social-security system is to be ready for the strains that will come with the end of the war and the adjustments that will be required by the transition to peace.

In view of these circumstances, it is important that the Congress should give immediate consideration to the proposals my colleague and I submit for the extension of our existing social-security program.

In asking that the Congress act promptly on our social security bill we are not proposing hasty or intemperate action. We have behind us nearly 10 years of actual experience under the Social Security Act. We have had nearly 2 years of intensive discussion of the bill which Senator WAGNER and I introduced in the Senate, and which Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, introduced in the House, on June 3, 1943. I join with Senator WAGNER in requesting, most earnestly, that our present bill be made the subject of prompt and full hearings in the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York and the distinguished junior Senator from Montana and the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York be printed as a Senate document, and that 25,000 copies be

printed, so that Senators may be able to mail them all over the country in response to requests from their constituents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the acting parliamentarian that such a request requires action by the Committee on Printing. The request should be referred to that committee.

Mr. LANGER. Will not that procedure be avoided, Mr. President, if unanimous consent is obtained?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The law requires reference of such a request. The Chair is advised that compliance with the Senator's request would violate the law.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Can we not, by obtaining unanimous consent, avoid that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only by ignoring the law. The Chair will state to the Senator that the request should go to the Committee on Printing, and an estimate of the cost will have to be secured.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Am I to understand that before the Senate can take such action, the request must first be referred to the Committee on Printing?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes—for the reason that a law on the subject has been passed by the Congress, and the Senate cannot by unanimous consent overrule that law or disregard it.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 93. An act for the relief of Mary G. Margraf;

S. 194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston;

S. 498. An act for the relief of W. C. Wornhoff and Josephine Wornhoff;

S. 519. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka;

S. 567. An act for the relief of Mrs. Freda Gullikson;

S. 645. An act to suspend until 6 months after the termination of the present war section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; and

S. 647. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 938) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 383) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FLANNAGAN, Mr. ZIMMERMAN, Mr. PACE, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. KINZER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of L. S. Strickland;

H. R. 341. An act relating to the status of Keetoowah Indians of the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 378. An act authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), and for other purposes;

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1058. An act for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Harold J. Grim;

H. R. 1243. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. J. Rhea, Sr.;

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia M. Tonner;

H. R. 1547. An act for the relief of W. H. Baker;

H. R. 1599. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Norfolk-Portsmouth Bridge, Inc.;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Charles E. Surmont;

H. R. 1677. An act for the relief of Hires Turner Glass Co.;

H. R. 1725. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Surface Shaughnessy;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.;

H. R. 1838. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of A. G. Bailey against the United States;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 1947. An act to authorize an increase in the pay of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms;

H. R. 1975. An act for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young;

H. R. 2001. An act for the relief of Betty Ellen Edwards;

H. R. 2002. An act for the relief of Joseph Wyzynski;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of the Cowden Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 2518. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2699. An act for the relief of Dr. Jabez Fenton Jackson and Mrs. Narcissa Wilms Jackson;

H. R. 2725. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucile Manier, as administratrix of the estate of Joe Manier;

H. R. 2727. An act for the relief of the estate of Herschel Adams, deceased, and Pleas Baker;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane Strang;

H. R. 2754. An act to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933, and to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States District Courts of the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Nelson R. Park;

H. R. 2949. An act to extend 5-year-level-premium-term policies for an additional 3 years;

H. R. 2951. An act to exempt certain members of the Economic Stabilization Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 2966. An act authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a special medal of honor to Franklin Delano Roosevelt;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of the heirs of Henry B. Tucker, deceased;

H. R. 3081. An act for the relief of August Svelund; and

H. R. 3102. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to employ on part time, clerks, stenographers, typists, and machine operators holding positions in other Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 21st instant,

Mr. OVERTON (for Mr. TYDINGS), from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3109) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, reported it on May 22, 1945, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 287) thereon.

#### CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, enclosing copy of a despatch from the American Embassy at Quito, Ecuador, transmitting a resolution of the Ecuadoran Permanent Legislative Commission, expressing condolences on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, former President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

#### NINETEENTH REPORT OF LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the nineteenth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act for the period ending March 31, 1945.

On May 6, 1945, Nazi Germany capitulated to the combined forces of the United Nations. Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease as the basic mechanisms of combined Allied war supply made a vital contribution to that victory.

The defeat of Germany was the first objective of Allied military strategy. There remains, in the Pacific, another powerful and fanatical foe, the Japanese, who, in the never-to-be-forgotten and fateful Sunday of December 7, 1941, struck at Pearl Harbor in a treacherous blow against the peace and security of the world. They, too, must be taught

that the peace and security of the world are sacred and not to be broken by any aggressor nation.

While the bulk of the United Nations forces were engaging the Nazis in Europe, Allied forces succeeded in piercing the perimeter of Japanese defenses and established the bases from which decisive offensives can be launched. Now all of the might and power of the United States, the British Empire, France, the Netherlands, and our other allies can be brought to bear, together with the Chinese forces, against Japan.

Long and costly as the struggle ahead may be, it has been immeasurably shortened by the system of lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. To crush Nazi and Japanese tyranny, we have sent overseas to join our allies on the battle front American fighting men equipped with the best weapons American ingenuity and skill can produce. They have been further strengthened through reverse lend-lease with all that they needed which our fighting allies could provide. Our fighting partners at the front had more men for the battle than they could supply and, through lend-lease, we sent the weapons, the food, and the material with which they could bear fully their burden of the battle.

We cannot measure the sacrifice and heroism of our American forces on the war front or the efforts of the men and women on the production front here at home. Nor can we measure the contribution to victory of those Allied fighting men who, with their own and lend-lease weapons, fought and fell, or the courage and valor of their people behind the lines who, steadfastly through long years under attack, produced the food and tools needed for victory. Each of the United Nations has contributed to the pool of fighting power in accordance with its abilities and capacities.

Adjustments and reductions in Allied war production and in the lend-lease program will be possible even as we and our allies throw augmented forces into the decisive offensives against the Japanese. The task of reconversion and reconstruction is commencing. At the same time lend-lease and reverse lend-lease must continue as a military necessity on the scale required to build the overwhelming power which alone can save American and Allied lives and bring an early and complete end to this terrible war.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 22, 1945.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 49)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1946, amounting to \$746,600, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### RESCISSIONS OF PORTION OF SEVERAL WAR AND WAR-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of the Congress proposed rescissions of portions of several war and war-related appropriations available for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to \$92,119,000, and applying to the appropriations for a number of departments and agencies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### SUSPENSION OF THE DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with a list of 643 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Immigration.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF JUNE 25, 1938

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of penicillin or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the executive assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the ceiling unit "Miscellaneous Researches," National Bureau of Standards, for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Whereas it is vital to the successful prosecution of the war that maximum war production be maintained; and

"Whereas our wartime economy has demonstrated that the great bottleneck in our productive capacity is manpower and it is imperative that the use of all available manpower, regardless of race, color, or creed, should be promoted and guaranteed; and

"Whereas it is also of the greatest importance to provide and insure the fullest possible opportunities for employment to all discharged war veterans and displaced war workers throughout the war and postwar periods, without discrimination because of race, color, or creed; and

"Whereas to preserve and maintain our fundamental democratic principles and to assure the fullest possible utilization of our manpower resources, the President of the United States, by Executive Order No. 882, established Fair Employment Practice Committee which has greatly contributed to the reduction and elimination of discrimination in employment in war industries; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, manifested by the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives in the legislature, that the said committee could be made an even more effective instrumentality for the establishment and maintenance of sound, democratic employment practices and policies if it were made a permanent governmental agency, given legal status, and endowed with full power and authority in law to make and enforce its decisions; and



"Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration the Chavez bill, bearing Senate 101, which authorizes and provides for the establishment and operation of such a governmental agency: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved (if the senate concur),* That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed appropriate legislation to establish a Fair Employment Practice Committee as a permanent governmental agency with adequate power and authority to accomplish the purposes of this resolution, and be it further

*"Resolved (if the senate concur),* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of expediting and supporting the consideration and enactment of such legislation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

#### "House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution to instruct the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington to request of the Congress of the United States the extension to Puerto Rico of various acts of Congress, and for other purposes

"Whereas the circumstance of Puerto Rico being an island constitutes a sufficiently powerful factor for the Legislature of Puerto Rico to wish to establish a School of Navigation for Officers of the Merchant Marine in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas the occupational possibilities that the establishment of a school of this kind would offer a part of our youth vocationally inclined, are obvious and unquestionable;

"Whereas it is reasonable that a school of navigation should enjoy, from the moment of its establishment in Puerto Rico, all such benefits as schools of the same order existing in continental United States, its possessions and territories, now enjoy by virtue of certain acts of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring):*

"First. To instruct the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, as he is hereby instructed, to request of the Congress of the United States of America, in behalf of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, the extension to Puerto Rico of the following acts of Congress: 34 U. S. C. 1128, of March 3, 1901; 34 U. S. C. 1121, of March 4, 1911; 34 U. S. C. 1122, of March 4, 1911; 34 U. S. C. 1123, of March 4, 1911; in order to obtain for Puerto Rico the same benefits obtained by the Government of the Philippine Islands on June 30, 1906, through the act of Congress 34 U. S. C. 1124.

"Second. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States of America, the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Immigration:

#### "House Resolution 230

"Resolution relative to memorializing the President and the United States Senate to approve H. R. 776, authorizing the naturalization of Filipinos

"Whereas the blood and suffering of the past 4 years have evidenced, at great price, the unwavering loyalty of the Philippines to the United States; and

"Whereas for four long months on the peninsula of Bataan 75,000 Philippine troops, fighting side by side with Americans, held at bay a ruthless enemy which was fully equipped and four times their number, defending to the bitter end the flag and ideals of this country and rendering up 21,000 of their brave men to unidentified death; and

"Whereas, by this heroic stand, the United States was given time to prepare in Australia; and

"Whereas through the bitter years following the fall of Corregidor 13,000,000 Filipinos maintained their loyalty and devotion to this country in the face of untold destruction and suffering; and

"Whereas now, once again, Americans and Filipinos are fighting side by side with profound realization of their common bonds and ideals, grimly bent toward final victory; and

"Whereas as a token of this country's appreciation and in tribute to the people of the Philippines there has been passed by the House of Representatives, and is now before the Senate of the United States, H. R. 776, by Representative McGEHEE, to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California,* That the President and the Senate of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized to approve H. R. 776 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the chief clerk is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and to the two Senators from California in the Congress of the United States."

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

#### "House Memorial 5

"Memorial to the President and the Congress of the United States urging the immediate activating of the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, to secure the benefits as intended in said act to States and political subdivisions and their instrumentalities

"Whereas the Seventy-eighth Congress passed Public Law 457, the same being known as the Surplus Property Act of 1944; and

"Whereas it is provided in said act for the establishment of a Surplus Property Board; and

"Whereas section 13 of said act gives priorities to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof over all other disposals of property except transfers to Federal agencies; and

"Whereas there has been no material compliance made with the provisions of section 13 aforesaid for the benefit of the local governments, but on the contrary there has been evidence that the Board and Federal agencies charged with the administration of the Surplus Property Act are neglecting, failing, and refusing to discharge their duties as required by said act and, further, are discriminating against said local governments, has been disclosed by recent investigations and events; and

"Whereas there have been disclosures of deliberate violations of the act pursuant to investigations by a special Senate committee of Congress, of the Board and of its activities; and

"Whereas it has been disclosed that the Board and its administrative agencies, in their refusal and failure to extend the priorities and benefits to States and political subdivisions and their instrumentalities, have deliberately and intentionally committed acts in violation and disregard of the Surplus Property Act and to the loss and injury of many local governments. Included among the violative acts of the Board and its administrative agencies was the enforcement of restrictive provisions that precluded the city of New York from making bids on a

great deal of material that it wished to purchase. Certain surpluses were offered to local governmental agencies at prices above current market prices and then, after having been turned down, were sold at lower prices to private bidders, and other such instances of disposals whereby local governmental agencies were not given proper chance to purchase; and

"Whereas a Senate subcommittee has failed to find evidence that any procedure has been established to get a coordinated statement of the requirements of State and local governments, and this subcommittee has determined that the demands of the local government units are certain to be large; and

"Whereas there has been no system provided by the Board for establishing priorities to local governments as intended by said act, nor has there been set up any reasonable means whereby local governments can regularly receive information as to surplus properties that may be bought; and

"Whereas local governments should have, and were intended by the Surplus Property Act to have, priorities and first opportunity except as to Federal agencies to buy surplus properties; and

"Whereas the Surplus Property Act contemplated that pursuant to its provisions a system should be devised and put into operation that would permit local governments to secure the priorities and maximum benefits intended by said act; and

"Whereas the true intent of the act has been completely ignored to the disadvantage, loss, and injury of the States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:* 1. That the President of the United States is hereby petitioned to lend his Executive powers in requiring that the Surplus Property Board, as provided to be appointed by the President under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, take immediate action to correct the evils now practiced by said Board in its discrimination against the States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, and in its persistent refusal to comply with the requirements of the said act.

"2. That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to make such further investigations of the administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, that may be necessary to determine the action by the Congress to correct the discriminations against the States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof and to insure the priorities and benefits to these local governments and their agencies that were intended for them under the provisions of the said Surplus Property Act of 1944.

"3. That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House, and President of the Senate in Congress and to each of Florida's representatives in both the House and Senate in Congress.

"4. That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the Journal of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Florida and that sufficient copies thereof be furnished to the press.

"Became a law without the Governor's approval.

"Filed in office, secretary of state, May 17, 1945.

#### QUIETING OF TITLES OF CERTAIN STATES TO LANDS BENEATH TIDE WATERS AND NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the State Land Board of the State of Oregon, relating to legislation quieting titles of certain States to lands beneath tide waters and navigable waters, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG., May 15, 1945.

The State Land Board met in special session in the conference room of the executive office at 10:45 a. m.

"Whereas the State of Oregon, since its admission to the Union in 1859, has always claimed title and does now claim title to all of the tide land and submerged land along the coast of the State of Oregon and in the bays and harbors thereof and three nautical miles westward from the coast line in the bed of the ocean; also from the banks of any navigable stream from the point of mean high water along said banks; and

"Whereas the courts of this State and of the United States, through all of this period, have held the title to all tide and overflow lands below mean high water belonging to the State of Oregon; and

"Whereas the courts of the Nation and of the respective States which have passed upon this question have held, with complete uniformity, that each State, upon its admission to the Union, became vested by its sovereignty with the absolute ownership of all tide and overflow lands, unless any of such lands had been granted prior to Statehood into other ownership by a sovereign then having dominion over said tide and overflow lands prior to the acquisition of that territory by the United States; and

"Whereas there has been introduced into the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, in the House of Representatives a joint resolution known as 'A joint resolution quieting titles of the States to lands beneath tide-waters and navigable waters': Now therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the State land board in special session, petitions its representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States to give their full support to the passage of the above-mentioned resolution quieting the title of all tide and overflow lands in the respective States to the States in which said lands are located; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States."

No further business appearing, upon motion, the meeting was adjourned.

EARL SNELL, Governor.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution directing the attention of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to the construction of farm ponds on small farms, and asking a change of policy in their program so as to equalize this work and build ponds on small farm units in the same manner as they do on larger farms

"Whereas at the present time the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in carrying out its farm-pond program, seems to be and is building farm ponds on large farms and ranches and neglecting, failing, and refusing to build farm ponds on small farm units; and

"Whereas this program should extend to farm units of all sizes: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the honorable Senate concurring therein)*, That we demand of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration a modification of their farm-pond program so as to include small-farm units in a like manner as larger units and build ponds thereon in equal proportions; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the clerk of the house of representatives shall mail a certified copy of this resolution to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Washington, D. C., and to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 17

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Federal Government and its Veterans' Rehabilitation Administration to avail itself of the efficacy of mineral waters, known by the trade name of radium water, in the city of Claremore, Okla., in the treatment of our returning soldiers of this World War II who are returning as casualties of the conflict and who require hospitalization and treatment for wounds and nervous disorders.

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein)* that:

"Whereas our returning soldiers from the present conflict in World War II brings to us a great number of casualties and a great number of men who are suffering from wounds of various and sundry kinds received in the service, and an enormous number suffering from nervous disorders on account of such service; and

"Whereas there is in the city of Claremore, Okla., a certain mineral water the efficacy of which has been proven for nervous disorders and for the treatment of various and sundry disorders caused by long service and wounds received as a result thereof; and

"Whereas it has been established beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the use of such waters, together with such treatments as hydrotherapy and physiotherapy, would go far toward rehabilitating these men from the conditions which they have present; and

"Whereas the efficacy of such in such cases has gone beyond the speculative or experimental stages and are recognized by the leaders of the medical profession and are known to be a wonderful relief for such; and

"Whereas the said waters at the said city of Claremore flows in abundance and would be available for such purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government already has located at the city of Claremore a fine hospital under Government control and supervision, known as the United States Indian Hospital, and around and near which is an abundance of room for many other units for the hospitalization of returned soldiers; and

"Whereas the city of Claremore is located at the intersection of two main trunk-line railroads, the Missouri Pacific leading from Kansas City Mo., to Little Rock, Ark., and the St. Louis & San Francisco, leading from St. Louis, Mo., to Oklahoma City, Okla., and Texas, and located on the main street of America, U. S. Highway No. 66, and is easily accessible to all sections of the country: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein)* That the Federal Government and its agencies having charge of such be and they are hereby memorialized to use such waters and their kindred treatments at the city of Claremore, within the State of Oklahoma, and to erect and maintain suitable quarters for such purposes adjacent to the said city as will enable the use of such waters for such purposes; be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Veterans' Rehabilitation Administration of the Federal Government, to the War and Navy Departments of the United States, and a certified copy to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen of the State of Oklahoma at the Capitol of the United States."

By Mr. WHITE:

A petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Maine, praying for the enactment of legis-

lation to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages of whatever content; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

Resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of a Federal-State plan of establishing and developing a national system of airports

"Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States certain bills intended to establish a national system of airports; and

"Whereas certain of these bills, particularly the Bailey bill, so-called (S. 34), and the McCarran bill, so-called (S. 2), in the Senate, and the Randolph bill, so-called (H. R. 4), in the House of Representatives, provide for the allotment of 25 to 50 percent of Federal appropriations for establishment and development of a national system of airports as direct aid to large municipalities for establishing and developing airports without regard to the interests of the States in which such communities are situated; and

"Whereas the States would have no control over such sums as might be allotted to municipalities for these purposes from the total of Federal appropriations but would be forced into competition with their larger municipalities for allotments of such funds to airports under State control; and

"Whereas the proposed direct allocation of large percentages of Federal appropriations for these purposes to municipalities is a departure from the established practice of allocating all grants-in-aid through the States, successfully followed since 1916 in the distribution of Federal appropriations in aid of highways and for other purposes; and

"Whereas the Council of State Governments, the Governors Conference, and the officers of the National Association of State Aviation Officials have joined in opposing the projected method of allocation on the ground that it is unnecessary, that it would complicate any sound plan for a national airport system, and would be likely to result in many abuses, particularly in the direction of increasing friction between the Commonwealth and such of its municipalities as might be eligible for direct aid under any of the proposed bills that might be enacted: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts, believing that the proposals specified are unnecessary, unsound, and undesirable, hereby urges the Congress of the United States to provide, in any plan that it may adopt in aid of the establishment and development of a national airport system, that grants-in-aid shall be made only to and through the several States, and that no part of such grants shall be made direct to municipalities, no matter how large, in derogation of State interests and authority; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the state secretary forthwith send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress, and to all Members of Congress from Massachusetts."

#### PETITIONS FROM MARYLAND

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYNGS], who is absent on official business, has asked that certain petitions from citizens of Maryland be presented to the Senate and appropriately referred. In his name I present the petitions and ask that they be properly referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions will be received and appropriately referred.



By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. TYDINGS): A resolution adopted by the city council of Baltimore, Md., commending the plan for a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on the Library.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Council of Churches and Christian Education of Maryland-Delaware, Inc., favoring adoption of the so-called Bretton Woods peace proposals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Graphic Arts Association of Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 17, to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Resolutions adopted by IWO Lodge No. 3871, Baltimore, Md., protesting the enactment of House bill 414, to reduce immigration quotas 50 percent; House bill 545, to end all immigration for 5 years after the termination of the present war, and House bill 677, to suspend immigration until the number of unemployed in the United States is less than 1,000,000; to the Committee on Immigration.

Resolutions adopted by IWO Lodge No. 3871, Baltimore, Md., protesting the enactment of House bill 511, to eliminate the educational and literacy requirements for applicants for citizenship who are 50 years of age or older and who have lived here since before July 1, 1924; House bill 173, to permit the naturalization of natives of India, and House bill 776, to permit the naturalization of Filipinos; to the Committee on Immigration.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of any prohibition legislation affecting the manufacture and sale of all fermented malt beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the mayor and common council of the city of Manitowoc, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation to complete the St. Lawrence waterway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Wisconsin Legislature has adopted a resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to develop the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway immediately upon termination of the war, and

Whereas the city of Manitowoc, having the finest harbor on the Great Lakes, is vitally interested in having the St. Lawrence waterway completed as soon as possible so that our city will receive all the benefits of increased shipping from our harbor: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Manitowoc,* That we urge our representatives in Congress to do all within their power to expedite the passage of necessary legislation to complete the St. Lawrence waterway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean; be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressman from this district and to our United States Senators from the State of Wisconsin.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES OF THE MISSOURI RIVER—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Nebraska Reclamation Association.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The board of directors of Nebraska Reclamation Association at its meeting at Lincoln, Nebr., this 11th day of May 1945, resolve as follows:

1. We note with interest, satisfaction, and approval the coordinated program projected jointly by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the resources of the Missouri River area, and we favor prompt action by Congress for carrying those plans into effect.

2. We appreciate the evidence so far indicated that these agencies in the further development of detailed plans, propose to consult with organizations in the various States whose primary interest is in the development of these resources in conformity with the best interests of the various localities within the valley. By such consultation we believe there can be established a well coordinated program for the most effective beneficial use of our soil and water resources.

3. We anticipate that when the operational stage is reached means will necessarily have to be developed for the effective coordination of the various activities and the avoidance of conflict with State laws and vested irrigation rights thereunder.

4. We urge that in the development of future plans for the operation of the various facilities now in contemplation adequate representation on behalf of the people domiciled in the Missouri Valley be provided for and the greatest possible home-rule powers be reserved to the people in the valley consistent with the efficient functioning of the facilities developed.

#### THE PINE RIDGE INDIAN AGENCY, S. DAK.—LETTER FROM RUSHVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a statement adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Rushville, Nebr., relating to the Pine Ridge Indian Agency, of Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

The statement was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RUSHVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

*Rushville, Nebr., May 14, 1945.*

#### To Whom It May Concern:

South Dakota residents have recently called it to our attention that a movement is on foot to displace certain Government officials, or personnel, including the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Pine Ridge Agency, Pine Ridge, S. Dak., and to replace them with certain Indians.

This movement does not in any sense represent the sentiments of the majority; on the contrary, it seems to be promoted by a few self-seekers, ambitious for personal power and gain.

Observations of informants is to the effect that everyone concerned would be better off under the present set-up, with present officials, rather than risk the future of all in the hands of those unqualified few who are agitating this drastic movement.

The Rushville Chamber of Commerce desires to go on record with the statement

that we feel that Superintendent W. O. Roberts, of the Pine Ridge Agency, and his very able fellow officials, are a definite asset not only to the agency but to the entire surrounding territory, including Rushville. He has proved to be the most cooperative agent in the history of the agency, ever willing to lend aid, both with advice and participation, in all community activities, and the citizens of Rushville feel deeply indebted to him for such aid in the past. The loss of Mr. Roberts would be felt in the entire territory, as well as within the agency, and to replace him, and others, with untried and unqualified personnel would defeat the very purpose of the Office of Indian Affairs, setting that department back 50 years in their endeavors.

The Rushville Chamber of Commerce feels that the proper procedure is to inform the various delegations of this movement, voicing our disapproval of it, requesting that these delegations then bring the matter to the attention of those in charge of Indian Affairs.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD DAVID, O. D.,

*President.*

GENE M. LEAHY,

*Secretary.*

#### SUGGESTED CHANGES IN PRICE CONTROL ACT—RESOLUTION OF NORFOLK (NEBRASKA) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Retail Trade Committee of the Norfolk (Nebraska) Chamber of Commerce, suggesting certain changes in the Price Control Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it resolved by the retail trade committee of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, Norfolk, Nebr., That—*

Whereas the present Price Control Act is now being studied by the House Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Congress, and will be considered by the appropriate committee of the Senate of the United States Congress; and

Whereas certain provisions in said Price Control Act, and certain interpretations of said act work injustices and hardships upon retail merchants which in many instances are unfair and inequitable and should be corrected: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by this body,* That the following changes in the extension of the Price Control Act be made in order to assist in eliminating said injustices and inequalities:

1. The law provides that price ceilings shall be "generally fair and equitable." In administering the law OPA has "squeezed" the normal gross margins of retailers by forcing them to absorb increases in production costs while maintaining retail prices. Congress should define the term "generally fair and equitable" to prevent the present "squeeze" and insure price ceilings that are fair to all retailers under whatever business conditions may develop.

2. Permit the courts to use discretion as to granting injunctions in cases of purely technical or nonwillful violations that inevitably occur among billions of transactions.

3. Grant to the United States district and circuit courts, nearest the point of business of the petitioner, the right to review OPA decisions.

4. Extend the act to allow proper control over commercial rents in war emergency areas.

5. Renew the act for a 12-month period, not 18 months as proposed by others; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. HUGH BUTLER, and Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY, United States Senators from Nebraska, and to Hon. KARL STEFAN, Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of the State of Nebraska, urging their support for these proposed changes.

**NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, with the signatures, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, a petition signed by officers of 37 organizations of the District of Columbia, including many of the principal business, labor, civic, educational, political, and social groups supporting Senate Joint Resolution 9, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting a new power to the Congress with respect to the people of the District of Columbia. Under this new power the Congress, by subsequent legislation, would be enabled to grant to the people of the National Capital voting representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

In plain language, it would make it possible for these people to participate in the government of their country, just as truly as the Government of that country now requires them to fight, bleed, and die on its fields of battle and to bear all the civic burdens precisely as if they had a part in the Government.

The amendment for which these petitioners pray is a brief, clear-cut proposal which is strictly in harmony with the language and spirit of the Constitution. It opens the way for the United States to prove the sincerity of its demand that the people of all lands shall participate in the Government of their own country.

Adoption of this amendment is the first required step toward affording an opportunity to my friends on the other side of this Chamber to show their adherence to the plank in the Democratic Party national platform promising suffrage for the District of Columbia.

These petitioners are not asking that the control of the Congress over the seat of the National Government be taken away from Congress or in any way diminished. They are simply asking that the Congress through the amendment give to itself the power to make participating American citizens of our fellow countrymen marooned in this voteless and unrepresented realm. Congress would continue to hold and exercise every power over the District which it now possesses, the only difference being that after the exercise by Congress of the new power, the people here, through their duly elected Representatives and Senators, would be a part of that Congress.

Mr. President, this is a fundamental American proposal to grant to Congress a power over the Federal district which it should have possessed from the very beginning. Now, with the participation of nearly 100,000 from the District in the armed forces of our country in the greatest of all wars, it is time that we pause and ask ourselves if it is right, if it is American, to deny to those who fight

our battles, who leave their homes and undergo hardships, are wounded and die, the same participation in the government of our country as possessed by those who serve from the States. They are all comrades in arms, comrades in danger and many are comrades in death—why should they not be comrades in exercise of peaceful participation in the government of their country?

The strangest experience in my long membership in the Senate is that I have never heard anyone give what could be considered as a valid reason for depriving these fine fellow Americans of our National Capital of their natural-born right of participation in the Government of our country. I ask Senators what reason or excuse can we give for prolonging this condition which is a contradiction of the most cherished principles of our government?

What an example to the people of all nations—the greatest democratic republic of all time preaching the doctrine of participation in government by all peoples of all lands and all the while maintaining a contradiction of that belief at its very heart. Senators, it is time that we match our practice with our preaching and remove this blot from the national escutcheon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and appropriately referred.

The petition, with the signatures attached, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Your petitioners, the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, and the presidents of its constituent and cooperating organizations, whose names are subscribed below, hereby reaffirm the principles proclaimed by the founders of our Republic that "Taxation without representation is tyranny"; that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and in order that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" may become an accomplished fact for all the people of the United States, respectfully represent:

"That the over one-half million totally disfranchised and unrepresented citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia, obey national laws, outnumber the residents of each of 12 States, and pay more national taxes than each of 29 of the States.

"That over two decades ago, when they outnumbered only six States, they supplied to the Army and Navy of the United States, a larger number of men than any one of seven of the States, and oversubscribed their quotas of all wartime funds.

"That again in the present war for the preservation of the principles of democracy and civilization as against depotism and barbarism thousands of these voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District of Columbia are now by voluntary enrollment and by draft serving in the armed forces of our country.

"That these, your fellow Americans, now have no voice in their National Government which requires them to fight, to bleed, and perhaps, to die.

"That as a fundamental right they are as justly entitled as are other Americans, to voting representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

"That the only sound reason which can be offered for any departure, in the case of the

District of Columbia, from the fundamental American concepts of representative government is for protection of the national interest in the Nation's seat of Government, and then only to the extent required for such effective protection.

"That this protection of the national interest—coupled with recognition of the interest and rights of the people of the District—is provided in our proposed constitutional amendment which confirms in Congress continuing control of District representation so that both the Nation's and the District's interest may always be equitably protected.

"We, therefore, respectfully petition the adoption of House Joint Resolution 62 and the identical Senate Joint Resolution 9, which propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant the above sought relief to the citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia.

*"THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT"*

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

Theodore W. Noyes, chairman, Citizens' Joint Committee on District of Columbia National Representation; E. Barrett Prettyman, president, Board of Trade; Wilbur S. Finch, president, Federation of Citizens' Associations (68 member groups); John Locher, president, Central Labor Union (151 local unions); Gertrude Parks, president, Federation of Women's Clubs (31 clubs); Alice B. Duffield, president, Voteless District of Columbia League of Women Voters; J. G. Bell, president, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association; Clarence E. Kefauver, president, District of Columbia Building and Loan League; John J. Carmody, president, Bar Association; Nadine Lane Gallagher, president, Women's Bar Association; Raymond G. Dunne, president, Federation of Business Men's Associations (24 associations); Robert J. Buxbaum, president, Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor (293 local unions); Harry N. Stull, chairman, Inter-Federation Conference; Theodore W. Noyes, president, Association of Oldest Inhabitants; Roscoe Jenkins, president, Northeast Washington Citizens' Association; Lewis T. Breuninger, president, Washington Real Estate Board; Matt Meyer, president, Advertising Club of Washington; Mrs. Howard G. Nichols, president, Twentieth Century Club; Marguerite McD. Luckner (Mrs. John T.), president Women's City Club; Etta L. Taggart, president, Society of Natives of the District of Columbia; Elizabeth M. Cox, president, Washington Zonta Club; Lillian Deire, president, Washington Section, National Council of Jewish Women; A. Julian Brylawski, president, Motion Picture Theater Owners of the District of Columbia; Jack Morton, president, Junior Board of Commerce; Abe Coonin, president, Associated Retail Credit Men of Washington, D. C.; E. B. Simms, president, Hotel Greeters of America, Charter 31; Neil Baird, president, Newcomers Club; Florence M. Meara, president, Soroptimist



Club; Etta L. Taggart, president, The Washingtonians; Hazel Fenning (Mrs. Karl), president, American Association of University Women, Washington branch; Leon H. Neville-Thompson, department commander, Department of District of Columbia Veterans of Foreign Wars (15 posts); Lee R. Pennington, department commander, Department of District of Columbia American Legion (44 posts); John J. Saunders, president, District of Columbia Chapter, Rainbow Division of Veterans; Malcolm S. McConihe, Democratic National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; E. F. Colladay, Republican National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; Mrs. M. B. Fetzer, president, District of Columbia Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations (70 associations); Wilbur S. Finch, president, District of Columbia Suffrage Association.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 101. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; without amendment (Rept. No. 290).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2875. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; with amendments (Rept. No. 288).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2839. A bill to increase the salary of the executive secretary of the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 289).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 130. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 291).

S. 716. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 293).

S. 732. A bill for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 294).

S. 761. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in Quonset Hut occupied by Eighty-third United States Naval Construction Battalion at Camp Rosseau, Port Hueneme, Calif., on December 22, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 295).

S. 822. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged in a fire at Naval Base Two, Rosneath, Scotland, on October 12, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 296).

S. 823. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the United States naval hospital, Seattle, Wash., on May 10, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 297).

S. 824. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in Quonset Hut E-172 at the amphibious training base, Camp Bradford, naval operating base, Norfolk, Va., on January 20, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 298).

S. 984. A bill to permit waiving of the bonds of Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 292).

S. 1003. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy certain Government housing facilities on a rental basis without loss of rental allowances; without amendment (Rept. No. 299).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 626. A bill for the relief of William D. Warren; without amendment (Rept. No. 300).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1009. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, for the purpose of continuing it in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 301).

S. 1010. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, for the purpose of continuing it in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 302).

H. R. 1812. A bill to authorize an award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System; without amendment (Rept. No. 303).

H. R. 2322. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Mexican Border Service Medal to certain members of the Reserve forces of the Army on active duty in 1916 and 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 304).

H. J. Res. 136. A joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt Fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 727. A bill for the relief of the commissioned officers of the United States ship *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; with an amendment (Rept. No. 306).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of Marlin-Rockwell Corporation with respect to the jurisdiction of The Tax Court of the United States to redetermine its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals:

H. R. 2125. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 308).

#### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

#### REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures, I present a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of April 1945.

The total number of paid employees for April 1945 is 3,002,258, excluding 429,173 employees of the War Department stationed outside the continental United States as of December 31, 1944. The grand total of employees within and outside the continental United States is 3,431,431 as of April 30, 1945.

The grand total of employees stationed outside continental United States reported for April 1945 is 548,577. Of this figure, 429,173 are employees of the War Department and the remaining 119,404 are reported by other departments and agencies.

During the month of April 1945, 40 departments and agencies decreased by 21,844 employees, while 22 departments and agencies increased by 10,083, making a net decrease of 11,761 for the month of April.

The following departments and agencies show the greatest reductions: War Department, 11,691; Navy Department, 6,830; Commerce Department, 696; and Office of Censorship, 477.

Those departments and agencies which increased during the month of April are as follows: Post Office Department, 2,880; Agriculture Department, 1,891; Veterans' Administration, 1,751; and Office of Price Administration, 788.

It is worth noting that the national war agencies alone show a net increase of 917. This added to the net increase of 639 shown in the March report amount to 1,556 additional employees being placed on the already overburdened Federal pay roll, in the last 60 days. The committee feels that such increases are not essential toward the war effort.

The increases in such agencies as Office of Price Administration which is a total of 1,359 for the months of March and April should be noted. This increase is more than the total employment of the Securities and Exchange Commission—1,158—and is equivalent to adding another agency to the spreading bulk of existing Government. That is not all. The increase for the War Manpower Commission for the same 2 months amounted to 523 and the Office of Strategic Services, though it showed a decrease of 82 for March now comes up with an increase of 340 employees for April.

This amounts to a net increase in the war agencies, for 2 months, of 2,222. On the basis of the average per annum salary of Federal employees the cost of employment for this increase in personnel would equal the purchase of 272,565 War bonds of the \$25 denomination which would supply funds enough to secure 567,844 "Mae Wests" for use in fighting the Japanese war.

The above figures show that steps should be taken to bring about the elimination of all nonessential civilian employees. However, those emergency war agencies that have succeeded in reducing personnel are to be commended. This commendation is further extended to those departments that reduced personnel. Since these departments, as regular established organizations, not only perform wartime duties but must also perform the regular nonwar activities as well, should serve as an example to the war agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report submitted by Mr. BYRD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

# REDUCTION IN NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

*Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of March and April 1945, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees*

Department or agency	March 1945	April 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT</b>			
Bureau of the Budget.....	588	581	-7
<b>DEPARTMENTS</b>			
Agriculture Department.....	78,550	80,441	+1,891
Commerce Department.....	29,963	29,267	-696
Interior Department.....	41,849	42,259	+410
Justice Department.....	27,257	27,004	-253
Labor Department.....	6,431	6,135	-296
Navy Department.....	760,603	753,773	-6,830
Post Office Department.....	376,127	379,007	+2,880
State Department.....	10,042	10,291	+249
Treasury Department.....	96,365	96,037	-328
War Department.....	1,176,332	1,164,641	-11,691
<b>NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES</b>			
Committee on Fair Employment Practice.....	140	140	-----
Foreign Economic Administration.....	6,419	6,457	+38
National War Labor Board.....	3,756	3,703	-53
Office of Alien Property Custodian.....	784	773	-11
Office of Censorship.....	9,458	8,981	-477
Office of Civilian Defense.....	106	102	-4
Office of Contract Settlement.....	61	66	+5
Office of Defense Transportation.....	3,525	3,462	-63
Office of Economic Stabilization.....	12	13	+1
Office of Inter-American Affairs.....	1,273	1,262	-11
Office of Price Administration.....	62,503	63,381	+788
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	1,338	1,326	-12
Office of Strategic Services.....	2,385	2,925	+540
Office of War Information.....	9,687	9,679	-8
Office of War Mobilization.....	104	188	+84
Petroleum Administration for War.....	1,025	1,008	-17
Selective Service System.....	19,040	18,980	-60
Smaller War Plants Corporation.....	1,853	1,874	+21
War Manpower Commission.....	28,043	28,393	+350
War Production Board.....	12,677	12,667	-10
War Shipping Administration.....	5,307	5,383	+76
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	1	1	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	348	336	-12
Civil Service Commission.....	7,423	7,696	+273
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	512	507	-5
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	59	58	-1
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,556	1,539	-17
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,482	1,438	-44
Federal Power Commission.....	657	648	-9
Federal Security Agency.....	31,643	31,850	+207
Federal Trade Commission.....	438	436	-2
Federal Works Agency.....	20,730	20,455	-275
General Accounting Office.....	13,081	13,143	+62
Government Printing Office.....	7,022	6,976	-46
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,015	1,991	-24
Maritime Commission.....	11,674	11,464	-210
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	6,604	6,664	+60
National Archives.....	334	323	-11
National Capital Housing Authority.....	225	225	+1

<sup>1</sup> Includes several thousand employees who work only a few hours daily.

<sup>2</sup> Does not include employees stationed outside continental United States.

## Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government—Continued

Department or agency	March 1945	April 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued</b>			
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	18	17	-1
National Gallery of Art.....	258	254	-4
National Housing Agency.....	16,073	15,769	-304
National Labor Relations Board.....	789	792	+3
National Mediation Board.....	107	97	-10
Panama Canal.....	29,516	29,693	+177
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1,907	1,886	-21
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	10,764	11,258	+494
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,158	1,154	-4
Smithsonian Institution.....	414	412	-2
Tariff Commission.....	291	288	-3
Tax Court of the United States.....	120	119	-1
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	13,153	13,112	-41
Veterans' Administration.....	59,694	61,445	+1,751
Total.....	3,014,019	3,002,258	-11,761
Net decrease.....			-11,761
War Department.....	429,173	429,173	-----
Grand total.....	3,443,192	3,431,431	-11,761

<sup>3</sup> Includes employees stationed outside continental United States as reported by various departments and agencies excepting the War Department; totals, March, 119,369; and April, 119,404.

<sup>4</sup> Does not include such employees formerly reported in a terminal leave status.

<sup>5</sup> Employees stationed outside continental United States reported quarterly as of Dec. 31, 1944.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum and without-compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1041. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Velma G. Turner, as successor trustee to Allen W. Turner, for the uses and benefit of Allen W. Turner, Jr., under deed executed October 13, 1931, recorded in book 401, page 368, clerk's office, Bibb Superior Court, and/or Allen W. Turner, Jr., of Macon, Georgia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1042. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of penicillin or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1043. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (by request):

S. 1044. A bill to authorize the use of certain lands of the United States for flowage in connection with providing additional storage space in the Pensacola Reservoir of the Grand River Dam project in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1045. A bill to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the

Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of underage at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes; and

S. 1046. A bill to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1047. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to suit numbered E-344 entitled "Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians versus United States," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1048. A bill for the relief of A. M. Strauss; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. McCLELLAN introduced Senate bill 1049, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 1050, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. TUNNELL):

S. 1051. A bill for the relief of William J. Simpson;

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of John E. McBride; and

S. 1053. A bill for the relief of John R. Rogers, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1054. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to maximum prices for foodstuffs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charlie South and Mrs. Charlie South; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1056. A bill to prohibit the naturalization of aliens until 6 months after the termination of the war; and

S. 1057. A bill to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization as an independent agency of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 68. A joint resolution to provide for designation and appointment of June 10 as Lidice Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. J. Res. 69. A joint resolution to provide for the preparation and publication as an official document of railroad cost scales or tables and related information; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

## TERMS OF OFFICE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICERS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to fix the terms of office of all officers of the Federal Government other than Cabinet members, judges, and officers of the uniformed services and postmasters, at a term of 2 years.

If the bill is enacted into law I think it will bring the administrative departments of government under closer supervision and control of the Congress, in that each 2 years all appointive administrative officers of the Government will come up for reappointment, and for reconfirmation by the Senate of the United States, and thus the legislative branch of the Government, the Congress, will be able to keep better supervision and control of the administrative agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, in view of the subject matter dealt with by the bill, I think the



Committee on the Judiciary is the appropriate committee to which to have it referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1049) to fix the terms of office of all officers of the Federal Government, other than Cabinet members, judges, and officers of the uniformed services, and postmasters at 2 years, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3109) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 2, 1945, an allowance of \$2,500 per annum for the purpose of increasing the compensation of Senators; to defray expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties and until a general readjustment of salaries and expenses can be made. Actual expenses of Senators related to or resulting from the discharge of their official duties (including expenses for travel, lodging, and subsistence while away from their State domiciles in the performance of their official duties) shall be deductible for income-tax purposes. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, \$358,667, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 3, 1945, to June 30, 1945, both inclusive, shall be immediately available.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3109, the legislative appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 3, line 19, strike out "\$3,600" and insert "\$4,500"; and

On page 3, line 21, strike out "\$3,120" and insert "\$3,800"; and

On page 3, line 9, strike out "\$5,000 and \$1,500 additional" and insert "\$8,500."

Mr. BURTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3109, the legislative appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 14, line 6, strike out "\$4 per day" and insert "\$5 per day."

On page 14, line 7, strike out "\$15,204" and insert "\$19,005."

On page 14, line 7, strike out "\$279,494" and insert "\$283,295."

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. BURTON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 1 and 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3109) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 14, line 6, to strike out "\$4 per day" and insert "\$5 per day"; in line 7, to strike out "\$15,204" and insert "\$19,005", and strike out "\$279,494" and insert "\$283,295."

Mr. BURTON also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to House bill 3109, the legislative appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

#### PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES IN INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 540) to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 4, line 7, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to coin coins containing an ounce of gold, such coins to contain 480 grains of pure gold (Troy weight) and to contain sufficient alloy to make them nine-tenths fine and to weigh 35 times the weight of a gold dollar containing 15 5/21 grains of gold nine-tenths fine."

On page 4, line 23, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to use all silver in the Treasury not held as security for outstanding currency of the United States and all silver which may from time to time come into the Treasury to pay that part of the subscription of the United States to such International Monetary Fund which is not required to be paid in gold under the provisions of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund: *Provided further*, That all silver which may be paid into such International Monetary Fund shall be valued in terms of gold from day to day on the basis of the commercial or fair world value per ounce of such silver and on such basis such silver shall be regarded as the full equivalent of gold: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to affect the obligation of the United States to pay in gold to such International Monetary Fund that portion of its subscription thereto required under the terms of such agreement to be paid in gold."

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE—ANNIE L. NESBITT AND OTHERS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 96) for the relief of Annie L. Nesbitt and others, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals and the proposed change is perfectly satisfactory to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

#### REQUEST FOR RETURN OF A BILL FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the 21st instant, the Senate passed the bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital. I understand that the matter in-

volved in the measure has been settled, and instead of passing the bill the Senate should have indefinitely postponed it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate, and I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the House will be requested to return the bill to the Senate, and the motion to reconsider the bill will be entered.

#### PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON MONTEREY BAY, CALIF. (S. DOC. NO. 50)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated January 25, 1944, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Monterey Bay, Calif., with a view to improvement of Moss Landing, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. WILSON (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight-saving time," approved January 20, 1942, the Congress hereby designates the date on which the two Houses of the Congress concur in the provisions of this concurrent resolution as the date on which such act shall cease to be in effect.*

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR ORDERED PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of L. S. Strickland;

H. R. 1058. An act for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Harold J. Grim;

H. R. 1243. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. J. Rhea, Sr.;

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia M. Tonner;

H. R. 1547. An act for the relief of W. H. Baker;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Charles E. Surmont;

H. R. 1677. An act for the relief of Hires-Turner Glass Co.;

H. R. 1725. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Surface Shaughnessy;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.;

H. R. 1838. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of A. G. Bailey against the United States;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor;

H. R. 1975. An act for the relief of Glass-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young;

H. R. 2001. An act for the relief of Betty Ellen Edwards;

H. R. 2002. An act for the relief of Joseph Wyzynski;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of the Cowden Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 2518. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2699. An act for the relief of Dr. Jabez Fenton Jackson and Mrs. Narcissa Wilms Jackson;

H. R. 2725. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucile Manier, as administratrix of the estate of Joe Manier;

H. R. 2727. An act for the relief of the estate of Herschel Adams, deceased, and Pleas Baker;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane Strang;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Nelson R. Park;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of the heirs of Henry B. Tucker, deceased; and

H. R. 3081. An act for the relief of August Svelund; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 341. An act relating to the status of Keetoowah Indians of the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 378. An act authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2754. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma", approved January 27, 1933, and to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States District Courts of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 391. A bill to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1599. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Norfolk-Portsmouth Bridge, Inc.; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 2949. A bill to extend 5-year-level-premium-term policies for an additional 3 years; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2951. A bill to exempt certain members of the Economic Stabilization Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2966. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a special medal of honor to Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 3102. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to employ on part time, clerks, stenographers, typists, and machine operators holding positions in other Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### THE PURPLE HEART—LETTER TO GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to Gen. Douglas MacArthur by John W. Anderson, which has been reprinted from the Gen. Douglas MacArthur edition of the Purple Heart, the official organ of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and adopted as a creed by that organization. It represents a fine expression of my own philosophy of the American Government.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR: The world knows you not only as a skillful militarist but also as a devout humanitarian. Out of these and other commanding qualities has come your greatness as a general.

Those who have served America and humanity at your command know well that nothing within your resources will ever be left undone to heal and help those wounded in any cause for which you fight.

But neither the warmth of your great heart, nor hatred for the beasts that seek to break it, will alone suffice to bring to bearers of the Purple Heart that comfort and security their sacrifice has won for them their right to earn.

That millions of grateful hearts may bleed for him, sincerely and in deepest sympathy, can never satisfy the longing of the bearer of the Purple Heart for the proud right to feel a part of what goes on in our America—and, too, the prouder right to know that what he gives to neighbors measures, according to his strength, a fair return for what those neighbors give to him.

All must return to civil life—to renew such hopes and to resume such helpful tasks as their remaining years and strengths permit. That these honored casualties of war may not become the hopeless wreckage of a helpless industrial economy, confused by false doctrines and bedeviled by an entrenched bureaucracy, is a responsibility of no one man—but of our entire citizenry.

The sacrificial heart that conquers seething jungles and its venomous Japs is the same stout heart that learned its sportsmanship—and built its strengths and skills—in the eager competitions of the sandlots and the open enterprises of our free America.

America was born in the blood of productive peoples made desperate by prolonged extortions. Men fought and died that children might go free.

As your brave soldiers fight today they learn again, the bitter way, the ruthless crimes of men gone wild with overmuch authority—as petty men so often do.

The children of America today are the controlling citizens of its tomorrow. What they believe, today, shapes the America to come.

For America lies not in her waters and her fields—not in her mines and factories. Those are but the workshops and the playgrounds of America.

America lies instead in the minds and hearts of her people. As their faith endures, her traditions hold fast. As their courage lives, there is sustained her will to fight aggression—whether from without, and armed with guns, or from within, and armed with false philosophies.

Our America will survive only through the determination of succeeding generations of her people to permit, along her road to higher destiny, no meddlesome hitchhikers, eager to grab the steering wheel of government and throw away the maps that brought her safely where she is today.

There are among us deluded men who teach that we should shackle now, at home, that courage which, inspired by the inducements of our open enterprise, has built that tough creative and productive muscle which, twice now in less than half a century, has helped free men to turn the tide against enslaving tyrannies.

There are among us faltering men who teach that the peacetime tasks of our citizens, tomorrow, will exceed their understanding—and their strength. They plead for acquiescence in their witless plans, by which all citizens would share alike, and eat, what cake there is—while those among us skilled

in failure mix and bake another batch by history's repeatedly discarded recipes.

Thus is defined, for our returning champions, a task no less important than today's defense by them against armed foreign gangsters bent upon destruction of all liberty, wherever found.

May the contagious courage of returning bearers of the Purple Heart, and of their comrades, so inspire our faltering people as to lift them far above the deadly teachings of fanatical impracticals. May that same courage, by example, set our Nation firmly on the road to new and limitless frontiers unveiled for us from day to day by patient men of science and invention.

Our debt to you, Stout General, is measured not alone in lands reconquered and in enemies destroyed. Just as your courage and resourcefulness inspire your soldiers to heroic deeds so you, and your companion immortals leading our fight at other battlefronts, lift to new heights the courage of our people to achieve all things which strengthen our America.

And may she be full strong to meet that sacrificial hour which comes again as there is ended, in stupidity and greed of unredeemed humanity, the next long armistice.

May your strength endure—and may your tribe increase.

JNO. W. ANDERSON,

GARY, IND., December 1944.

#### STATE-WIDE PLANNING OF VETERANS' EDUCATION

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a digest with comments on "Data for State-Wide Planning of Veterans' Education," prepared by Ernest V. Hollis at the request of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### VETERANS WILL STUDY TO UP-GRADE EMPLOYABILITY

(A digest with comments on Data for State-Wide Planning of Veterans' Education, (United States Office of Education Bulletin 1945, No. 4, by Ernest V. Hollis), prepared by the author at the request of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. The bulletin is based on data supplied by the War Department and on published material from other agencies.)

Most veterans will want new or better jobs when they return to the civilian labor force. Fortunately situated men have worked to that end while in the armed forces. Many of these and their comrades expect to give full or part time to preparing for a career when they are eligible for benefits under the GI bill of rights or Public Law 16. Without this aid most veterans would have to return to their old jobs or seek one in a labor market in which they never had a place and for which they likely are not prepared.

According to the War Manpower Commission less than one-fourth of the 1,500,000 men and women who have been separated from the armed forces have returned to their old jobs. The proportion is expected to decline as the younger men and women who never had a permanent job are demobilized. In fact, it must be remembered, the provision in the Selective Service Act which guarantees the veteran his old job was enacted before we entered the war and on the assumption that after a year of military training the individual would return to civilian life. It would be unrealistic to expect ambitious young men who had their feet no higher than the first rung of the employment ladder when they entered the armed forces to return willingly



to jobs as farm hands, messengers, clerks, waiters, filling station attendants, and the like. In 4 or 5 years of war many of them have attained recognition for the technical or leadership qualifications they possess. They are, of course, ambitious to have comparable status in postwar civilian life and many are willing to pay the price in additional education and training that is required for the careers they envision.

A poll of 20,000 soldiers in every major theater of the war, made by the Research Branch of the War Department's Information and Education Division, shows two-thirds of the white troops have definite plans for a better postwar career, and that an additional 17 percent have tentative plans. About half of the Negro troops have definite career plans. Immediately or after further education and training, it is estimated that of an expected veteran population of fourteen or fifteen million men and women approximately a million men (7 percent) will enter or return to business for themselves, most of them taking advantage of the loan provision of the GI bill of rights; in a like manner, 850,000 men (6 percent) plan to own and operate farms. In round numbers, 750,000 (5 percent) say they expect to secure or return to jobs in National, State, and local government. The nearly four-fifths remaining are planning careers in the professions, return to private business as employees, and careers in the armed forces.

In preparation for these careers, the Army poll indicates that roughly a million (7 percent) of the fourteen to fifteen million men and women mentioned in the preceding paragraph may be expected to return to school and college full time for some period of education and training. An additional two and a half million (18 percent) servicemen are expected to study part time. Age and previous education are the important considerations in predicting who actually will resume formal schooling. Over 90 percent of the men who said they definitely plan to return to school and college full time were under 25 years of age, 90 percent had the formal requirements to enter or resume college work, 93 percent were unmarried. Four-fifths of the men had all three characteristics, and all but 3 percent had at least two of them.

However, one-third of the men who were eligible to return to college said they expected to take vocational training without regard for whether it was college-level work. Servicemen who plan to upgrade their employability through attending school part time while holding a job, follow a different pattern from that just described. Two-thirds of this group were under 25 years of age and unmarried, and half of them were eligible for college work. Two-thirds of those eligible for college work said they also intended to take vocational courses.

What would the national education and training picture be like if all men and women in the armed forces should distribute themselves after the fashion of the sample of 20,000 men? Even the outline of an answer is of crucial importance to those groups in each State who are responsible for planning education, training, and employment for veterans. Moreover, it is a matter of concern to all laymen who assume that the postwar economic and cultural program of the United States will be influenced significantly by veterans.

Through the cooperation of the War Department it has been possible to prepare for planning bodies a series of tables that show by States and regions the age and education of 7,144,401 enlisted men. These tables also show the education of 729,193 officers. At the end of 1944 the national distribution shows 47 percent of the enlisted men were 26 years of age and older. If they follow the sample polled, this group will not furnish more than 10 percent of the men who return for schooling. Therefore, the nature, size, and incidence of veterans in the school population is more likely to be learned from a study of the previous education of the 53 percent 25 years of age and under who, according to the poll, are likely to furnish 90 percent of the men returning for full-time schooling and two-thirds of those who expect to study part time.

One of the first jobs of planning groups and interested spectators is to estimate how many of the veterans who plan to come back for training will have completed elementary school, high school, and college. This will need to be done by States as well as for the Nation as a whole, because the responsibility for providing education rests with the States individually. After that, planners can make a calculated guess as to what veterans will want to study and can begin to develop and coordinate facilities for that purpose. Table 1 (from U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1945, No. 4), which accompanies these comments, shows a considerable variation among the States in the proportion of men at the several levels of education. Table 2 provides a key for estimating the number from each category who are likely to want further schooling. In general, table 2 shows that up to college graduation the more education the men had when they entered the Army the greater the likelihood of their returning to school. It is, of course, recognized that academic credit for military courses and experience will enable many of the men to return to school at levels higher than their preservice formal education indicates. It is also probable that a greater percentage than is indicated of the men with less than high-school education will return to school; men

at these levels of education often do not make up their minds very far in advance of events.

Once the size and incidence of veteran enrollment is foreshadowed, the next job is to make some calculated guesses as to what program of studies will be in demand. While the educational choices of veterans who have already resumed schooling may not be representative of the choices all veterans will make, they at least are straws in the wind. According to reports compiled by the Veterans' Administration, four-fifths of the men receiving educational benefits under the GI bill of rights are studying in colleges, and one-fifth of them are pursuing vocational courses of less than college grade. Approximately one-fifth of the men in college are studying an arts and sciences program, and four-fifths of them are enrolled in professional and technical curricula. The distribution of men with service-connected disabilities who are being rehabilitated to employability under the financially more liberal provisions of Public Law 16, is not essentially different from that of men studying under the educational provisions of the GI bill.

There is a wide variation among the States in the proportion of Army personnel they have at each of the levels of education already mentioned. The variations shown in table 1 are, of course, due largely to the quality and variety of educational opportunities the States were able to provide for their youth in the decade before the outbreak of World War II. No judgment should be entered against a State or invidious comparison be made without taking into account relative financial ability to provide education and the effort made to do so. For example, it is not very meaningful to say that California has done a better job than Mississippi of educating its soldiers—unless it is also shown that its relative taxable wealth is so much greater that with one-third less tax rate it each year collects \$122 per child 5-17 years of age as compared to \$24 per child in Mississippi. The real marvel may be that Mississippi has done so much with so little.

In planning for the education and training of veterans it must never be forgotten that while the Federal Government pays the bill of the individual veteran, each State is responsible for the quality and variety of schooling provided within its borders. Available information indicates that each State may expect to provide programs for the number of men it sent to the armed forces, and of a level and variety suited to their civic and vocational needs. Polls indicate that each State may expect at least 80 percent of its native sons to return home for education and employment, and that States with superior opportunities may expect up to one-fifth more veterans than they sent into the armed forces.

TABLE 1.—Distribution of Army enlisted men to show the educational level of men 25 years of age and under<sup>1</sup>

State, by region	Total	Percent 26 and over	Percent 25 and under	Number and percent of enlisted men 25 years and under at four educational levels								
				Total	Grades 1-8		1, 2, 3 years of high school		4 years of high school and 1, 2, 3 years of college		4 years of college and up	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Continental United States.....	7,144,401	47.0	53.0	3,789,545	899,127	23.7	1,233,304	32.5	1,551,800	41.0	105,314	2.8
New England:												
Maine.....	43,130	47.8	52.2	22,499	6,422	28.5	7,920	35.2	3,044	35.8	113	.5
New Hampshire.....	23,931	46.8	53.2	12,721	3,094	24.3	3,623	28.5	5,851	46.0	153	1.2
Vermont.....	16,369	50.0	50.0	8,194	1,760	21.5	2,234	27.2	3,998	48.8	202	2.5
Massachusetts.....	227,809	50.8	49.2	112,137	20,667	18.4	39,761	35.5	49,560	44.2	2,149	1.9
Rhode Island.....	39,204	50.8	49.2	19,271	3,792	19.7	9,123	47.3	5,882	30.5	474	2.5
Connecticut.....	104,672	47.1	52.9	55,371	9,489	17.1	20,466	37.0	24,130	43.6	1,286	2.3
Middle Atlantic:												
New York.....	807,137	52.3	47.7	385,223	48,098	12.5	152,729	39.7	173,474	45.0	10,922	2.3
New Jersey.....	262,123	50.5	49.5	129,789	23,740	18.3	40,541	38.2	53,618	41.3	2,890	2.2
Pennsylvania.....	596,196	44.1	55.9	333,338	61,114	18.4	116,764	35.0	149,788	44.9	5,672	1.7

<sup>1</sup>Compiled from data supplied by The Adjutant General of the Army.

TABLE 1.—Distribution of Army enlisted men to show the educational level of men 25 years of age and under—Continued

State, by region	Total	Percent 26 and over	Percent 25 and under	Number and percent of enlisted men 25 years and under at four educational levels								
				Total	Grades 1-8		1, 2, 3 years of high school		4 years of high school and 1, 2, 3 years of college		4 years of college and up	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
East North Central:												
Ohio.....	386,404	46.5	53.5	206,856	31,442	15.2	73,892	35.7	98,627	47.7	2,895	1.4
Indiana.....	185,833	45.1	54.9	101,975	15,036	14.7	31,454	30.9	53,369	52.3	2,116	2.1
Illinois.....	452,823	50.5	49.5	224,030	38,334	17.1	81,003	36.2	101,254	45.2	3,439	1.5
Michigan.....	288,339	43.0	57.0	164,237	28,465	17.3	60,758	37.0	72,772	44.3	2,242	1.4
Wisconsin.....	145,032	46.7	53.3	77,255	13,713	17.7	23,614	30.6	38,710	50.1	1,218	1.6
West North Central:												
Minnesota.....	136,886	52.1	47.9	65,518	14,146	21.6	17,869	27.3	32,487	49.6	1,016	1.5
Iowa.....	114,910	49.4	50.6	58,108	10,604	18.4	13,989	24.1	32,298	55.6	1,127	1.9
Missouri:												
White.....	180,688	47.0	53.0	95,760	26,454	27.6	25,600	26.8	41,939	43.8	1,758	1.8
Negro.....	14,236	49.9	50.1	7,134	2,086	29.2	2,826	39.6	2,222	31.2	0	0
North Dakota.....	29,394	53.1	46.9	13,790	4,134	31.3	2,978	21.6	6,092	44.2	406	2.9
South Dakota.....	27,519	51.5	48.5	13,337	3,871	29.0	3,348	25.1	5,888	44.2	230	1.7
Nebraska.....	58,799	51.3	48.7	28,654	4,646	16.2	6,575	22.9	16,891	59.0	542	1.9
Kansas.....	90,448	49.1	50.9	46,034	8,552	18.6	11,190	24.3	25,954	56.4	338	.7
South Atlantic:												
Delaware:												
White.....	13,131	42.3	57.7	7,581	2,031	26.8	3,113	41.1	2,437	32.1	0	0
Negro.....	2,254	31.9	68.1	1,535	409	26.6	509	33.2	617	40.2	0	0
Maryland:												
White.....	85,837	43.9	56.1	48,155	12,724	26.4	15,364	31.9	17,829	37.0	2,238	4.7
Negro.....	22,562	50.2	49.8	11,246	6,482	57.6	3,267	29.1	1,497	13.3	0	0
District of Columbia:												
White.....	29,976	56.4	43.6	13,083	1,015	7.8	3,655	27.9	7,977	61.0	436	3.3
Negro.....	17,651	52.8	47.2	8,332	2,733	32.8	3,418	41.0	2,181	26.2	0	0
Virginia:												
White.....	103,680	46.1	53.9	55,922	19,527	34.9	16,593	29.7	18,651	33.4	1,151	2.0
Negro.....	34,222	43.9	56.1	19,201	11,055	57.6	5,342	27.8	2,524	13.1	280	1.5
West Virginia:												
White.....	97,625	43.2	56.8	55,383	19,987	36.1	15,364	27.7	19,360	35.0	692	1.2
Negro.....	6,006	34.6	65.4	3,930	1,092	27.8	1,706	43.4	1,132	28.8	0	0
North Carolina:												
White.....	127,767	42.7	57.3	73,174	24,307	33.2	24,787	33.9	22,794	31.2	1,286	1.7
Negro.....	39,935	42.9	57.1	22,822	12,965	56.8	7,322	32.1	2,216	9.7	319	1.4
South Carolina:												
White.....	54,600	42.8	57.2	31,259	10,209	32.7	10,356	33.1	10,220	32.7	474	1.5
Negro.....	27,846	39.4	60.6	16,890	9,963	59.0	4,981	29.5	1,809	10.7	137	.8
Georgia:												
White.....	104,418	47.0	53.0	55,341	15,847	28.6	18,038	32.6	20,373	36.8	1,083	2.0
Negro.....	41,102	39.8	60.2	24,751	15,046	72.9	4,486	18.1	1,949	7.9	270	1.1
Florida:												
White.....	65,954	53.1	46.9	30,917	7,716	24.9	8,122	26.3	14,458	46.8	621	2.0
Negro.....	27,929	47.8	52.2	14,591	8,417	57.7	4,263	29.2	1,911	13.1	0	0
East South Central:												
Kentucky:												
White.....	131,957	42.8	57.2	75,430	33,723	44.7	19,914	26.4	20,507	27.2	1,296	1.7
Negro.....	13,757	56.6	43.4	5,975	2,749	46.1	1,998	33.4	1,160	19.4	68	1.1
Tennessee:												
White.....	130,494	45.2	54.8	71,481	31,405	44.0	18,817	26.3	20,670	28.9	589	.8
Negro.....	22,125	44.4	55.6	12,292	7,339	59.7	3,343	27.2	1,473	12.0	137	1.1
Alabama:												
White.....	96,646	44.2	55.8	53,983	18,749	34.7	18,048	33.4	16,510	30.6	676	1.3
Negro.....	39,893	39.6	60.4	24,105	15,064	62.5	6,662	27.6	2,311	9.6	68	.3
Mississippi:												
White.....	62,989	45.0	55.0	34,637	9,205	26.6	11,574	33.4	12,868	37.0	990	3.0
Negro.....	51,684	42.4	57.6	29,743	22,244	74.8	5,707	19.2	1,792	6.0	0	0
West South Central:												
Arkansas:												
White.....	77,711	46.9	53.1	41,275	14,906	36.1	11,781	28.6	14,047	34.0	541	1.3
Negro.....	19,438	42.5	57.5	11,176	7,119	63.7	3,282	29.4	707	6.3	68	.6
Louisiana:												
White.....	82,244	45.9	54.1	44,481	15,220	34.2	12,367	27.8	16,104	36.0	890	2.0
Negro.....	44,599	44.8	55.2	24,642	15,420	62.6	5,879	23.8	3,275	13.3	68	.3
Oklahoma:												
White.....	101,089	44.8	55.2	55,828	15,067	27.0	17,763	31.8	21,848	39.1	1,150	2.1
Negro.....	8,164	36.8	63.2	5,161	1,774	34.4	1,855	35.9	1,464	28.4	68	1.3
Texas:												
White.....	301,622	48.3	51.7	156,066	46,848	30.0	49,776	31.9	57,406	36.8	2,036	1.3
Negro.....	51,926	44.7	55.3	28,727	13,442	46.8	10,303	35.9	4,845	16.8	137	.5
Mountain:												
Montana.....	26,574	51.5	48.5	12,888	2,234	17.3	3,046	23.6	7,201	55.9	407	3.2
Idaho.....	24,567	47.1	52.9	12,993	2,442	18.8	3,286	25.3	7,010	53.9	255	2.0
Wyoming.....	12,042	47.4	52.6	6,337	1,422	22.4	1,151	18.2	3,696	58.3	68	1.1
Colorado.....	50,281	49.9	50.1	25,194	4,673	18.5	7,147	28.4	12,888	51.2	486	1.9
New Mexico.....	28,836	43.7	56.3	16,235	5,416	33.4	4,408	27.1	5,746	35.4	665	4.1
Arizona.....	24,180	45.8	54.2	13,113	4,808	36.7	3,600	26.7	4,737	36.1	68	.5
Utah.....	30,018	40.7	59.3	17,801	920	5.2	5,391	30.3	11,168	62.7	322	1.8
Nevada.....	8,598	56.6	43.4	3,728	474	12.7	1,198	32.1	1,853	49.7	203	5.5
Pacific:												
Washington.....	81,814	49.4	50.6	41,425	4,554	11.0	12,692	30.6	23,705	57.2	474	1.2
Oregon.....	51,590	49.4	50.6	26,080	4,116	15.8	8,739	33.5	13,089	50.2	136	.5
California.....	385,279	51.7	48.3	186,185	20,529	11.0	57,376	30.8	103,887	55.8	4,393	2.4



TABLE 2.—Educational plans of Negro and white enlisted men, classified by previous education, summer, 1944<sup>1</sup>

Plans	Percent among men who have—									
	Grade school 1-8		High school				College			
			1, 2, 3 years		4 years		1, 2, 3 years		4 years and over	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Plans for full-time school:										
Definite.....	0.6	0.4	3.6	2.2	10.9	7.7	26.0	25.5	16.0	6.8
Tentative.....	6.8	1.6	5.6	2.2	10.7	5.0	10.6	6.9	16.0	5.8
Plans for part-time school:										
Would prefer full-time school, but planning										
part-time only.....	7.7	3.6	10.8	4.8	10.8	8.0	10.9	8.6	13.5	9.1
Want part-time school only.....	28.7	8.8	22.7	12.5	19.0	12.4	18.3	10.6	15.4	9.5
No plans for further education.....	61.2	85.6	57.3	78.3	48.6	66.9	34.2	48.4	39.1	68.8
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Reproduced from Report No. B-133, Post-War Educational Plans for Soldiers, Army Service Forces 1944.

## DEPORTATION OF HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, several weeks ago I made an address before the Senate on the subject of the deportation of Harry Bridges. I desire to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I received from a longshoreman at Long Beach, Calif., touching upon this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

See where you attacked Harry Bridges. You are right. I am a longshoreman, but I also have two sons in the service, one in the Navy in the Pacific and one in Europe with Patton. I want to get the goods to them. Bridges got a rule which limits a load on a sling board to 2,100 pounds. That is what is called the Pacific-coast agreement with employers. He calls it safety, but it is not that. It is slow-down that we were taught before the war. There are many other slow-down practices. We can lift only 2,100 pounds but soldier gangs working the same equipment pick up 4,500 pounds and I know the Army wouldn't do anything unsafe with them. This is pure bosh. It seems if Bridges wants to be so patriotic as he pretends he would enter into an agreement with the employers for the duration of the war to lift more on the pallets and to discontinue other slow-down methods under the agreement. The agreement is all we hear about in the union hall and other places. It makes me sick just as it does every waterfront worker with a son, brother, or father out there battling. We are for getting the goods to them and getting it there fast. Thanks for calling attention to this very bad situation. I wish I could sign my name but if I did the union officials would hound me to eternity. I wouldn't get anything but crap jobs and would be put in a crap gang. They have their ways. I think those in the waterfront work here are just about even for and against Bridges. All the commies are for him though and that is about one out of three in the union. Then the paid officials are for him. But not the men with interest in servicemen. Why doesn't he agree to call off load-limit during the war if he is trying to do best for our boys? That's a shame, and I know it, for I lift them measly loads every day and if you get a pound more on there you are skinned for breaking the agreement. Yet the soldier gangs come right behind us and put on twice as much on one pallet load.

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAILEY AT COMMENCEMENT OF MEREDITH COLLEGE, JUNE 3, 1940

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BAILEY at the commencement exercises at Meredith College, Raleigh, N. C., June 3, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE LIGHT METALS INDUSTRY IN THE WEST—ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR OF OREGON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Light Metals Industry in the West," delivered by Governor Earl Snell, of Oregon, at the Western Governors' conference, at Reno, Nev., on April 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ERNIE PYLE—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM E. KELLEHER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorial address on the late Ernie Pyle, delivered by William E. Kelleher at a memorial service held at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on May 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING ON NATIONAL PRAYER DAY BY ARCHBISHOP FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Prayer of Thanksgiving After Victory, offered by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, May 13, 1945, National Prayer Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

## POSTWAR ECONOMIC PLANNING—FULL EMPLOYMENT

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Department of Commerce on the developments in Canada with respect to postwar full employment, which appears in the Appendix.]

## RACIAL DISCRIMINATIONS IN GOVERNMENT POLICY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the outline of contents and an abstract of the report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service on Racial Discriminations and Governmental Policy in Foreign Countries, which appear in the Appendix.]

## DATA FOR STATE-WIDE PLANNING OF VETERANS' EDUCATION

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from Education Bulletin 4 of the Office of Education entitled "Data for State-Wide Planning of Veterans' Education," and comments thereon by Dr. Ernest V. Hollis, who prepared the report, which appear in the Appendix.]

## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Union Council Backing Seaway—Philadelphia (Pa.) Labor Group Asks CIO to Make Fight for Project Developments," published in the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of May 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ATTITUDE OF THE SOUTH ON THE FEPC BILL—ARTICLE BY THURMAN SENSING

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of the FEPC entitled "The South Takes a Stand," by Thurman Sensing, which appears in the Appendix.]

## CABINET CHANGES—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials commenting on recent changes in the President's Cabinet, published in the Washington News, the Washington Star, the Washington Post, and the Baltimore Sun, which appear in the Appendix.]

## CENSORSHIP OF NEWS PUBLISHED IN GERMANY—ARTICLE BY JOHN W. HILLMAN

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the censorship of news in Germany, written by John W. Hillman and published in the Indianapolis Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused for most of the session today to enable me to keep a speaking engagement in New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, beginning Monday of the coming week a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys will hold hearings at Salt Lake City. I am a member of that subcommittee. It is quite urgent that I attend the hearings. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate during the period when the hearing will be held.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is their objection? The Chair hears none, and consent is granted.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask consent of the Senate to be absent next week. I shall be away on business, but, at my own expense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and consent is granted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on a trip to Europe which is to be taken by certain members of the subcommittee on the War Department of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member. I am uncertain how many days the trip will require.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I understand that this afternoon the Senate will take up for consideration House bill 3109, and on page 2 thereof is found an amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I shall have to be absent from the Senate a part of the time today, and therefore refer to the matter now.

The issue before the Senate is raised by the amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to which I have referred, as well as by House bill 3109 itself, providing for a \$2,500 tax-exempt expense allowance for Senators and Representatives.

The issue is a simple one. Should there be added to the compensation which each Senator and Representative receives an additional amount of \$2,500 per annum?

The arguments for the measure, as they have already been stated in the House debate, are briefly as follows:

First. Each Representative and Senator pays out of his own salary a considerable amount of money for expenses which, if he were in private business or in any other public position, he would be allowed to take credit for in his income-tax return.

Second. Each is required to bear the expense incident to maintaining two homes. Until the last 6 or 7 years, a Representative or Senator would spend a great deal of his time at home, because Congress would only remain in session some 4 to 6 months. But now he is away from his home the entire year, with the result that he is put to large additional travel expense and the maintenance of two homes.

Third. As has already been indicated, men in business, when they are away

from home, have their expenses paid. This is true also of Government officials who travel on Government business. Their transportation, hotel bills, and other necessary expenses are paid. This also applies to Army officers and Navy officers when they travel on Government business. They receive subsistence and other expense allowances. Practically every Governor and mayor likewise has an expense account when he is looking after public business.

Fourth. In the office, any businessman or Government official, except a Representative or Senator, can charge telephone calls to his expense account. A Senator has the right of only 10 long distance calls a month. This provision for 10 calls only went into effect in July 1944.

Fifth. Since businessmen have had to come to Washington during the war period, every Senator and Representative is called upon to entertain his constituents in the dining rooms of the respective Houses. This amounts to no inconsiderable amount in a year's time. In business this would be a deductible expense, and it is really part of the service that the Senator and Representative renders to his district and his constituency. In fact, during the luncheon hour, the constituent is given an opportunity to air his problem with his Representative.

Sixth. Because of the above, it is contended that the \$2,500 provided for in this bill is not a salary increase, but rather an appropriate provision for those expenses incidental to the service rendered by a Representative and Senator.

Over against these arguments in favor of the bill, it has been clearly contended that:

First. This is a very inappropriate time for such a measure. We are at war and passage of this bill would only increase the pressure for wage increases of every group which feels that it is not adequately paid. Moreover, the proposed 25-percent increase, if it be considered a salary increase, is larger than that authorized under the Little Steel formula.

For some years past, we have been trying to avoid inflation. We have placed ceilings on commodity prices and wages. The danger of inflation is greater now than ever and we should not join in the slightest degree in any move that would break the Little Steel formula. If we vote this sum, what argument have we in the locker to meet the argument of certain labor groups for increased wages?

Shortly, we will be called upon to pass upon the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act. Faulty as that act has been administered in many directions, it seems to be the consensus among the Members that to repeal it now would open the floodgates. What is needed there is competent administrators, not so much at the top as in the various divisions and subdivisions. Many instances of square pegs in round holes in this great agency have come to the attention of every Senator.

But although injustice has been done on occasions, everyone seems to sense the imperative need to hold the general line. Doesn't that same argument apply to this matter now before us? With the war only half over, should we not resist every pressure which would make for higher prices and higher wages?

I fought last year to get the Congress to pass a bill that would permit salary increases to the white-collar workers where the workers and the employer could agree, when the increase would not involve wages higher than \$37.50 a week. The Senate passed that bill but the House turned it down. I cannot see how Congress can increase its own salary and not do likewise with the white-collar worker. It is the function of Congress to help hold the line. This sum of \$1,642,500, while inconsequential in amount to the total appropriations, does, in my opinion, make a breach of more significance than the sum involved.

Second. With our national debt approaching \$300,000,000,000, should we not be thinking of cutting corners wherever we can? This proposal would increase governmental overhead by only \$1,642,500, but should we not make every attempt, however small, to curtail nonwar appropriations?

Third. In Wisconsin and other States there is a constitutional prohibition against increasing (and that means directly or indirectly) the compensation paid to members of the State legislature.

Fourth. Our United States Constitution wisely provides that the President's compensation "shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected." Should not this provision apply in spirit to our Congress? As it now stands, the proposal would make the expense allowance retroactive to January 1945.

Fifth. This is not a matter of urgency and should be referred to the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization to take up.

Sixth. The argument has been advanced in support of this tax-free allowance that in 1929 a married person having a salary of \$10,000 and one dependent, paid a tax of \$415. Now on the same salary, he pays a tax of \$2,585—an increased tax voted by the Congress. This is not a valid argument for the expense increase. We all recognize the enormous financial obligations that have been placed on our Treasury because of the war. These obligations have required higher taxes to meet them.

Mr. President, when I ran for office and was reelected last fall, after almost 6 years in Washington, I had full knowledge of the situation, the amount of income tax I would pay, the sums that I would have to expend for travel, living expenses, and so forth, in Washington; the cost resulting from entertaining my constituents, and the maintenance of two homes—one in Wisconsin and one in the District of Columbia. I realized that if I had to educate my children, I could not have made ends meet on a Senator's salary. But I ran for reelection, knowing all those facts. I was re-



elected, and I do not feel that I can, under the present circumstances, vote for any direct or indirect increase of my compensation as Senator.

Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment reported by the committee.

**DATE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND TIME LIMIT FOR REPORT ON MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL**

Mr. BILBO obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may undertake to correct the RECORD in one respect.

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The other day, Mr. President, I requested unanimous consent to abrogate the rule in reference to the time limit which was placed upon consideration of the Missouri Valley Authority bill by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I find that although I proposed the unanimous-consent request, no action was taken upon it. I think that was due to the fact that I was interrupted by a number of Senators who desired information, and unfortunately the Chair did not ask whether there was objection. So the request was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire that the permanent RECORD be corrected?

Mr. OVERTON. I desire to propose another request, which I think will better cover the subject matter.

Mr. President, I propose the following unanimous-consent request: With respect to Senate bill 555, to provide for a Missouri Valley Authority, I ask unanimous consent that the provision in Senate Resolution 97, agreed to on March 15, 1945, requiring, in effect, that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation shall report on said bill within 60 days from the date of its reference to said committee, be abrogated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. When would the hearings be held and a report be made?

Mr. OVERTON. The author of the bill said that when he returned from Montana, which would be about the middle of June, he and I would confer with regard to the matter and undertake to fix a time for hearings on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Was it the plan to have the matter go over for the summer?

Mr. OVERTON. There was no plan whatever. The Senator from Montana desired that there be a postponement of the consideration of the bill by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. OVERTON. Then, Mr. President, I notify everyone concerned beginning on June 4, 1945, hearings will be held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on the proposed

Missouri Valley Authority. All witnesses, including the Governors of the various States who may be interested, must be present on that date in order to be heard.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. The author of the bill will be absent when the hearings are held. I regret it very much. I have endeavored to extend to him the courtesy for which he asked, and I regret that the Senator from North Dakota is taking the position which he has assumed.

Mr. OVERTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I rose to make a motion to take up a bill, but before doing so I desire to withdraw the announcement I previously made that on June 4 the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will begin the conduct of hearings on the Missouri Valley Authority. I am advised by the Journal clerk that the unanimous-consent request was granted on Monday last, and that it is not necessary that it should appear in the RECORD. Of course, the entry in the Journal has precedence over any omission in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has a copy of the Journal before him, and will say that that statement is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. So then it is understood that the hearings will not be conducted beginning June 4. I will state for the benefit of Senators who are interested that the hearings will be held at some later date which may hereafter be agreed upon between the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Do I correctly understand that the ruling was that unanimous consent was granted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent was granted on last Monday.

**TIME LIMIT TO REPORT ON SAVANNAH VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL**

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, these authority bills are so tangled up with requirements as to time limit on filing reports that it is utterly impossible for them all to be considered simultaneously. I find it necessary to make another unanimous consent request with reference to the Savannah Valley Authority.

I ask unanimous consent that the time limit fixed heretofore by unanimous consent for the report on Senate bill 737, to establish a Savannah Valley Authority, be abrogated. That is the bill in which the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from South Carolina are interested. I have understood from them that there will be no objection to the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that a similar unanimous request was made a few days ago, and granted.

Mr. OVERTON. The request was not in the precise language of the present request. It was that the hearings on the bill be postponed. I am now asking consent that the time limit on filing a report, as fixed heretofore by unanimous consent, be abrogated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**PROPOSED PERMANENT FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION**

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, a few days ago I read into the RECORD correspondence between the Reverend Louis L. Scott of Savannah, Ga., and myself. In that connection I wish to read a letter which I have just received from him together with a letter which he directed to the Manuscript, post office box 6666, Washington, D. C. The first letter to which I have referred is as follows:

Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,  
United States Senate Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter I am today sending to a Negro paper known as the Manuscript. Under its May 14 issue, it took exceptions to my letter sent you, and of which you read into the Senate RECORD. I do appreciate your doing that, for every truth, causes just such reaction, but this is no reason to let up, and believe me, I shall never do so until our aims are accomplished. I have received many letters of congratulation for my position. Therefore, again I want to thank you.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS L. SCOTT.

The second letter which I wish to read into the RECORD is as follows:

SAVANNAH, GA., May 15, 1945.

The MANUSCRIPT,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EDITORS: The immortal Wendell Phillips in his tribute to the gallantry of the great statesman and soldier, Toussaint L'Ouverture, had this to say: "You think me a fanatic tonight, for you read history, not with your eyes, but with your prejudices." If Phillips lived today and knew the facts, all the facts about which your Manuscript so miserably distorted, he would have said again, " \* \* \* you read \* \* \* not with your eyes, but with your prejudices." For it is very obvious you have never seen the speech of Senator BILBO, and it is a certainty you have never read it. Why not read it?

There never has been a measure proposed in the United States Congress to send Negroes back to Africa or anywhere else. I can see surprise register on your face. You did not know that. Negroes born or naturalized in the United States are citizens and are not subject to be "sent" anywhere, and are as much so as the Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO, who knows this as well as any person alive. If you don't know the facts relative to this proposed measure, you have only to ask me. I have them before me, and will send them to you at once, for you do need them.

Your article dares take issue with me on what I said, you simply starts and stops, calling names. I would ask an apology, when you say I am a Quisling, but I am too sure you don't know the meaning of the word. If taking the position that Africa should be in the hands of Negroes, from one side to the other, and from top to bottom, makes me a Quisling, then you do me honor by calling me such. In that sense George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Booker T. Washington, and Franklin D. Roosevelt were the greatest of Quislings, for they, too, believed in liberty and independence for all people.

Too many Negroes are dreamers and wishful thinkers, and unfortunately some of them operate what we are to understand is the "press," where they are in position to broadcast their distortions and inconsistencies to Negro children and their parents who are too busy to study and know the whole truth beyond what they read. The freedom

of speech and press are privileges which can prove themselves equally as dangerous, for they may misguide thousands.

Your Manuscript, in its reference to me, concludes by saying that Senator BILBO used my letter in his argument against the FEPC, and then you further say that I was "tricked" by the Senator in his revealing the contents of my letter on the floor of the Senate. What doubtless stirred your "fun-gus" was the fact that Senator BILBO opposed the FEPC, and, of course, my letter was merely an incident. I would say, "You know," but that would be an error, for you don't know; therefore I shall tell you.

This is the opinion of the Reverend Scott, of Savannah, Ga., who is one of the leading Negro preachers of the South. His letter continues:

The FEPC is a meaningless gesture on the part of a few politicians to divert the attention of Negroes from their basic needs, and the most good it will ever do is give a few dollars out to those who run around the country and talk about it. It is as impractical as perpetual motion, and as long as it is alive and wherever it is alive it will always provoke the race question, and introduce race consciousness and embitter the otherwise good relationship that could exist. If I had known Senator BILBO desired to use my letter in his fight against this measure I would have made it stronger, and may do so yet.

The race question is as deep rooted in this country as cancer, and any M. D. will tell you that anointing the spot with vaseline and covering it with a clean cloth will not cure it. So bring out your FEPC, your PEFC, or whatever you may wish it to be called, and the problem will remain \* \* \* until the condition is struck at its source.

I close with an analysis of the proceedings in question occurring in the Senate relative to Senator THEODORE G. BILBO's speech and proposed measure on April 24, 1939. It is headed "Voluntary resettlement of American Negroes in Africa," and after quoting Abraham Lincoln who said, " \* \* \* favorable to our interest to transfer the African to his native clime."

Here I desire to digress to remark that there are not many people who know that when Abraham Lincoln wrote the Emancipation Proclamation he made a part of it the proposition to resettle the Negro in some country other than the United States. That part of the proclamation is forgotten:

Then the speech gave vivid reasons and manner by which this may be done, leaving the matter of the Negroes' transfer to him and placing the burden of making the Negro secure in his native land upon the shoulders of the United States Government. Suppose the Big Three placed Africa in its entirety in the hands of Negroes; and Africa with all of its natural resources were placed under the direct supervision of Negroes, with the necessary help toward making that country into what it can and should be, coming from the great powers of the earth. Did you not know, with an educational program throughout that country with its vast millions of human beings, that Africa could and would rank among the leading powers of the earth? Then our position all over the earth would be different. Nation would dare not make laws and ordinances denying us of certain rights because we were Negroes, for we would be in position to retaliate in kind.

Ignorance and poverty will forever be the object of disrespect. A good illustration comes from this city. A Negro woman known for years as "Aunt Mandy" was called this by everybody, white and colored, with no disrespect to her. Her husband was accidentally killed and the company settled with her for \$5,000. No sooner had this information

gotten out before an automobile salesman went out to see her. But not once in the course of his sales talk did he call her "Aunt Mandy," but instead "Mrs. Johnson," to which she replied, "Just listen at my money talk."

No, Senator BILBO has not proposed sending Negroes back to Africa, nor have I pledged my help in doing so, but remember this: As long as one people or nation has that which belongs to another, the world will never be at peace. But when India shall be given back to the Indians, and China to the Chinese, and last but not least, Africa to the Negroes, then, and not until then, shall the "lamb and the lion lie down together," and a little child can lead them.

Now, if Manuscript is honest, it will retract what it has said of me, in which case I shall appreciate receiving a copy.

Very truly yours,

REV. L. LLEWELLYN SCOTT.

Mr. President, I desire to make a brief observation in connection with this excellent contribution by the Reverend L. Llewellyn Scott.

I have been accused of injecting the question of race relations into public discussions at a time when our country is at war. I think my colleagues will appreciate the fact that I have enough of genuine American patriotism not to want to do anything that would detract from or lessen our efforts to bring to a successful conclusion the second part of this World War; but I have been forced to do what I have done because it is evident to any observant mind that the principal minority group in this country—the Negroes—and I sometimes think there are a few other groups joining hands with them—are seeking to take advantage of the war situation to try to force upon the Congress and to propagandize through the press, over the radio, and on the hustings everywhere, ideas and conceptions which are utterly foreign to the people whom I represent in part on the floor of the United States Senate. So I have been compelled to speak out my opposition, even if we are in a war. They propose to take advantage of the situation. For instance, they demand the enactment of the FEPC legislation. We all know that that is sponsored by minority groups, and largely by the Negro group, and it is sponsored for no other purpose on earth except to destroy what they are pleased to call discrimination, because it is the philosophy, it is the contention of all the intelligentsia among the Negroes of the United States that any form, kind, or suggestion of segregation is discrimination. There never was a greater mistake made or a greater untruth uttered than to say that segregation is discrimination. If segregation is discrimination, we Democrats on this side of the aisle are guilty of discrimination, because we ask the gentlemen representing the Republican Party to sit on the other side. They are segregated on the other side. That is not discrimination.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With due respect to the merits or demerits of the FEPC bill,

political thought is largely motivated and political action is taken by political parties. If the question of a Fair Employment Practice Committee were not a matter that deserved attention, why was it that the two major political parties, the Republicans at their convention in Chicago, and the Democrats at their convention in Chicago, declared themselves in favor, and both Presidential candidates spoke in favor of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. Can the Senator tell us that?

Mr. BILBO. I shall be glad to answer the question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Or was it a question of political expediency?

Mr. BILBO. I shall be glad to answer the question; but I am surprised that the Senator should ask such a simple question, because we all understood and we all understand now, indeed we know, that this kind of legislation, un-American, unconstitutional, violative of every concept of the American way of life, legislation which is destined to bring almost a revolution in this country, was sponsored both by my party and by the other party and is being advocated today by Senators on this side of the Chamber and possibly on the other side for no other purpose except to satisfy the pressure of a group whose votes they want in the elections, just as has always been the case of political parties. Delegations representing these minority groups were there, demanding that the parties do something about discrimination.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I do not doubt the sincerity of purpose behind the answer of the Senator from Mississippi—

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from New Mexico knows it is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. BILBO. Some people hesitate to admit the truth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I have too much faith in the integrity of the Democratic Party to feel that the Senator might be correct.

Mr. BILBO. I will say that I have faith enough in the Democratic Party, in its ability and sagacity and ingenuity, to believe that it would put in the platform things which will appeal to the voters of the country; and that is what they were doing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I disagree with the Senator. I do not think that the Democratic Party and I do not believe that the Republican Party are so disloyal, so naive, as to make a pronouncement of political policy, a pronouncement of party pledges, in order to get a few votes.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, behind the scenes, and under cover, and in the cloak rooms, the Senator will find that the advocates of this measure do not hesitate to say, "We have to pass this in order to control, in order to get the votes of a certain minority." They do not make any bones about it, and why fool ourselves, and why be insincere about a thing? We know what this is intended for.



I say that if this bill shall ever become a law—and I pray to God it never will—if it shall ever become a law and there is an honest attempt to put it into force, it is not going to be considered a law against southern people in the interest of the Negro, but there will be found opposition springing up against it in every nook and corner of the United States, because when under the proposed law an agent goes out to California and tells every businessman or private enterprise that has six employees or more that a Japanese will have to be hired, hell is going to break loose, and we know what will happen if they go to other sections and say that a member of this nationality or that nationality must be employed. Yet that will be done, because the bill provides that there must be respect for ancestry. It is race, creed, color, religion, and ancestry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It says just that very thing, for the same reason that Congress has passed legislation which says to a selective service board, "Take this man, irrespective of his nationality or ancestry, and send him to feel the bayonet of a Japanese." If the Congress can do that, if it can take the little boy from the South, if it can pick up one of Polish ancestry, in Cleveland, and say, "Go into the Army and face all the damnation of the Germans, or go to Iwo Jima and feel all the dirt of the Japanese," how can it be said we cannot pass a law which shall say, "There shall be no discrimination against a person in the way of getting employment, or in having decent working conditions, or in being the recipient of what he fought for with the spirit of 1776?" The Senator from Mississippi can never convince the majority of American people by his argument.

Let me add, further, from the political standpoint, we, the Democrats, made a solemn pledge at Chicago, and either the Democrats stand behind that pledge, or I predict that it will not be long before many chairmen of committees in this body will be changed.

Mr. BILBO. The proponents are saying by this bill, "Good-by America, good-by freedom, good-by freedom of action on the part of the citizens of this country. We have the power in Washington, and we are going to the State where someone has a little business of seven employees, and tell him whom he shall employ in his business."

At Nashville, Tenn., there is a great Baptist publishing concern. I foresee the day when the head of the FEPC will go to Nashville and say to the Baptist brethren, "Look here; you are a kind of a close corporation, and you are printing books and papers that circulate throughout the country. That is interstate commerce, and we want you to employ this Catholic, we want you to employ this Negro, we want you to employ this Chinese, we want you to employ this Japanese, we want you to do this and that." Or he will go up to Boston, Mass., where the Christian Science Monitor and other publications of the Christian Sci-

ence Church are published. The adherents of that religious denomination are very enthusiastic about it. And they want no one there working with the outfit except those who believe in the Christian Science doctrine, or denomination. The FEPC says "Yes, sir, we are going to break up this outfit. We are going to put some people in here, perhaps Catholics, or those who belong to the Jewish religion," and so on. That is what it means.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The statement of the Senator from Mississippi indicates that possibly when he read the bill he did not do so very carefully, because there is nothing in the bill which provides for anything of that kind. It does not provide that one has to employ Catholics, or has to give a job to a Baptist, or to a Jew, or to a Negro, or to anyone else. All it says is that there shall be no discrimination because one does happen to be a Catholic or happens to be a Jew. That is all it says.

Mr. BILBO. That is the same thing. The Senator is admitting my statement, he is admitting my argument.

Of course, Mr. President, I did not mean to take up the time of the Senate with this out-of-line argument this morning, but I wish again to ask my colleagues to read the article by Mr. Sensing, which sets forth what is going to happen in the South if there is an attempt made to enforce the proposed law. This is a free country, and every man engaged in private enterprise should have some say-so about whom he shall employ in his place of business, and not have little autocrats or bureaucrats from the banks of the Potomac River tell him that he has to employ Mr. Jones because Mr. Jones has applied for a job, "and we think he is qualified, but you have turned him down because he happens to be a Catholic, or happens to be a Jew, or happens to be a Negro, or happens to be a Pole, or something else." I think a man should be permitted to organize his own affairs.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. BILBO. I shall yield, but I wish to make one further statement. The Senator says I have not read the bill. If it ever comes up for discussion, he will find that I have read it. The bill even proposes—and I am sure the Senator will desire to amend it when it is thoroughly exposed—to tell private enterprise whom they shall put into their places of business to carry on their industry or work, and it provides that this agency in Washington shall have the power to establish a thousand or ten thousand headquarters or agencies from which to operate, and then it is proposed to let them appoint a million agents to go forth and tantalize the American people, to see that the political party gets votes. That is what the proponents of the bill are after.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a short observation?

Mr. BILBO. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Mississippi can put any interpretation on the bill he deems proper. He has talked about the rights of industry and the

rights of business men to manage their own affairs and provide for their own protection, but he forgets the inalienable rights of the citizens of this country. Those should also be considered; and the time will come when we can consider those things.

#### STATEMENT OF MATTERS TO BE INVESTIGATED IN EUROPE BY A GROUP OF SENATORS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a group of Senators representing the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations, propose to go to Europe the latter part of this week to investigate matters which will later be the subject of legislation by Congress. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement of some of the matters which the committee has in mind to investigate be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee proposes to look into the vast redeployment program now in process of transferring men and equipment from Europe to this country and to the Pacific theater. They will visit redeployment centers to study the effectiveness of the plan for the discharge of men from the Army and get the views of men of all ranks and all branches of the service as to the fairness of this program and the efficiency of its operation. They intend to visit the centers where American soldiers released from German prisons are stationed and see how these men are being provided for and the steps being taken to repatriate them.

The committee will endeavor to get information as to the nature and extent of the properties and supplies which the Army does not propose to move to the Pacific theater or bring home. The administration of the military government in Germany and Italy and the methods being used by the Army and UNRRA to furnish food and clothing, as well as the extent and merits of future demands likely to be made upon this country for these supplies, will also be a subject of inquiry.

The members of the Naval Affairs Committee will be particularly interested in the operations of the great ports of Bremen and Bremerhaven, the administration of which has recently been taken over by the United States Navy. The committee will also view the scenes of some of the great decisive battles for a thorough understanding of the difficulties overcome by fighting our men and the efficiency of the equipment furnished them.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to make the trip to Europe to which I have just alluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and leave of absence is granted.

# ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—ACTIVITIES OF G. E. MACE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, about a month ago, many Members of the Senate received a pamphlet bearing the name of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York City and which was critical of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

In the pamphlet was reiterated the opposition to the project which this organization had maintained for 25 years or so.

In 1933 representatives of this association appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and argued against the St. Lawrence development on the basis that it was uneconomical and unnecessary.

The pamphlet, which has been sent to Members of the Senate, is signed by G. E. Mace, manager of the transportation bureau of this association. It is my understanding now that Mr. Mace distributed this booklet after the executive committee of the association had unanimously voted to take no further action with respect to the seaway, even though the association had consistently opposed it for 25 years.

Whether that is true or not is perhaps immaterial. The fact remains that this pamphlet, issued by Mr. Mace with or without the instructions of his executive committee, is literally reeking with false statements and misrepresentations.

I will mention only one of them here, and I mention that only because he makes reference to myself in it.

On page 6 of the pamphlet, it is stated that on March 17, 1944, the Legislature of the State of Vermont by a vote of 123 to 69 defeated a resolution to introduce the St. Lawrence project and that action was taken following an active campaign conducted by Senator AIKEN of Vermont in his home State in favor of the project.

This is a sample of the false statements contained in this pamphlet.

The facts are that on March 15, 1944, the Vermont Legislature was called into special session for the express purpose of enacting a soldiers' vote law. It was understood that nothing but emergency matters would be taken up at that session, yet someone, whose enthusiasm undoubtedly exceeded his better judgment, undertook to interject the St. Lawrence project into this special session of the legislature.

The matter was introduced without my knowledge and certainly any campaign on my part, and the legislature rightfully voted not to consider it at that time. If I had been a member of the legislature and had been present, I would have voted likewise.

As a matter of fact, more than 10 years ago, the Vermont Legislature created a commission to work for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. It is only fair to say that this commission has not functioned for several years and that work in behalf of the St. Lawrence is now carried on principally by agricultural and labor organizations and industrial associations in my State.

I give this illustration as a sample of the plain, unadulterated fallacies which saturate this pamphlet prepared and distributed by an employee of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

Other misrepresentations are pointed out in a letter which I have received from a member of the association itself, Mr. Julius H. Barnes, one of the most highly respected businessmen in America. I understand that Mr. Barnes is not the only member of this association who has repudiated Mr. Mace's false statements.

On the second page of this pamphlet are printed the names of the board of directors of the association. All of them are prominent business leaders in New York, and I hope for their own sake and for the sake of the reputation of the association for veracity, that they do not subscribe to such falsehoods as are perpetrated in this pamphlet.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter to me from Julius H. Barnes printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 10, 1945.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Recently, the Commerce and Industry Association of New York sent to every Member of Congress, a pamphlet signed by G. E. Mace, manager of their transportation bureau, attacking the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

I have been a member of this association for a quarter century and have also been president of the United States Chamber of Commerce three terms, and later also chairman for an additional three terms, believing always in business organizations and their expressions on public policy, rising above any local or selfish interest.

In all my experience with such organizations, there has never been issued a more inaccurate statement on any issue of public interest, than this particular pronouncement. It does a distinct disservice to public enlightenment on a great national question and an injury to public confidence in business organizations. This is particularly regrettable because in that association are many proven national business leaders of unquestioned public spirit who, if informed of such unfair statements, would not subscribe to such methods, reflecting little honor on an organization allowing thus an employee to use the association name.

Please point out to your colleagues some of the misstatements in this bulletin which violate American standards of accuracy and fairness.

For example, on the very first page, Mr. Mace says:

"The voyage from Montreal to Duluth entails 1,334 miles, much of which is difficult navigation."

This absurd statement is made although the Great Lakes constitute the greatest inland waterway system in the world. It handles in its 9 months season more than half the 12 months total tonnage of all the other three seacoasts of the United States. The far-western city of Duluth, although in winter latitude, ranks second in tonnage to the great port of New York. The single Lake Superior passes through the Soo locks each year three times the total tonnage of the whole Volga system serving all of Russia.

Is that "difficult navigation"?

Again, the pamphlet states (p. 4):

"It is proposed to construct 21 locks between Montreal and Duluth. These locks would constitute 21 physical barriers to navigation."

This is completely inaccurate. The whole St. Lawrence seaway from Montreal to Duluth would need only 16 locks, 8 of which are already constructed. Seven of these finished locks at the Welland Canal, built by Canada, costing \$130,000,000 wait today ready with ocean-size locks and depths for the great ships still blocked at Montreal by the outmoded locks and channels, half a century old. There are only three additional locks yet to be built by the United States, and five by Canada, all in the single stretch of 48 miles above Montreal. The association could have verified this easily by consulting the factual reports of the Department of Commerce completed under Secretary Jesse Jones. Only ignorance or intellectual dishonesty would have stated "21 physical barriers" to be constructed.

The pamphlet states (p. 4):

"The distance from the source of the St. Lawrence River (Lake Ontario) to the open sea is 1,182 miles. Navigation would be restricted for the entire distance."

Another completely inaccurate statement. Navigation from the Atlantic to Montreal (1,000 miles) is free and unhindered today for oceangoing vessels, even of 30-foot draft, until they are stopped by the 14-foot draft of the 50-year-old St. Lawrence locks at Montreal. In Document 110, Seventy-third Congress, the Interdepartmental Board stated, "The completed seaway from Duluth to the Atlantic Ocean will provide a waterway in which vessels may move with unrestricted speed over approximately 97 percent of the total distance."

The restriction seems to be only in Mr. Mace's anxiety to make a case.

The pamphlet states (p. 8):

"Throughout the years such steamship lines have either maintained an eloquent silence or have actively opposed the proposition."

On the contrary, in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations hearings of 1932-33 (p. 706), Robert Dollar, president of Dollar Steamship Lines, a great figure in placing the American flag on American ships all over the world, stated:

"Ships will certainly go to the Lakes for cargo . . . When the canal is finished there is no more reason for doubting that ships will go from the ocean to the Great Lakes than there is that ships will go to any port on the Atlantic seaboard. The fact that they can get nearer the center of the great producing country of the United States would be a great inducement in using the canal. Looking at the question from the shipowner's viewpoint, I am positive that it will be a great benefit to the shipowner, but more especially to the producers in the Pacific Northwest."

Take your choice between Mr. Mace and Capt. Robert Dollar.

In this record of omissions, evasions, and misstatements, please read page 5, citing the following questionable statements:

"In 1921 the International Joint High Commission reported in favor of the project . . . Congress declined to authorize the construction of the seaway."

"In 1932 . . . the treaty again failed of ratification."

"In 1934 the Senate . . . again withheld ratification."

"In 1941 . . . again Congress did not pass the requested legislation . . ."

The facts are that over all those years, the only action by Congress was a Senate vote of 1934, 49 in favor to 43 against. This followed the 1933 approval of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 15 to 5. In 1941 the only congressional action was the



approval by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, 17 to 8, and just two weeks before Pearl Harbor deferred consideration. Is the Mace statement an honest presentation of the record between 1921 and 1941?

The pamphlet states (page 6):

"New York never has approved this project in its entirety."

The facts are that under Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt, the New York Legislature passed unanimously the Power Authority Act directing that organization to promote both navigation and power on the St. Lawrence River. Through the succeeding administrations of Governor Lehman and the present Governor Dewey, repeated efforts to repeal or amend the Power Authority Act or to oppose the St. Lawrence seaway have been defeated. The State of New York through its legislature and its Governors, both Republican and Democratic, has steadfastly favored the development of both navigation and power on the St. Lawrence. Only last January 3, Governor Dewey, addressing the assembly stated: "For years I have advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project." The association's statement does not square with the facts.

Without burdening this letter with repetition of other inaccuracies and fallacies in that pamphlet, may I point out one important omission emphasizing its unfair methods and argument. On pages 12 to 15 is reproduced a letter from Mr. James Norris, of Chicago addressed to you, Senator, criticizing the seaway and claiming it would be of no benefit to the grain trade. That letter was from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12 last, where you, yourself, introduced it together with a detailed factual reply which Mr. Mace does not reproduce or even mention. To my mind your reply was an accurate and adequate refutation, and I speak on this point with a lifetime of grain exporting myself, and with a unique experience of World War I as President Wilson's and Herbert Hoover's head of the United States Grain Corporation.

If the deeper St. Lawrence had been open in that World War I, American and Canadian grain would have more nearly approximated the European price.

This pamphlet exhibits a curious history perspective. On pages 3 and 12 it goes back to 1900 to find the only unfavorable official report ever made on the St. Lawrence project. Even that report was immediately followed by the construction in 1903 of the present outmoded locks built for ships of 250 feet instead of today's 800, and for ships requiring 14 feet draft instead of today's 27 feet. The commerce of 1900 was handled in ships of 2,000 tons instead of today's 20,000. Turn back the clock.

In this pamphlet sent to every Member of Congress and widely to the press, the final paragraph is a striking example of selfish impudence. It reads:

"Having failed of justification on every point upon which support has been advanced, the project should permanently be abandoned. After approximately half a century of studies, estimates and discussion, it warrants no further expenditure of time, money, or consideration."

Your colleague should read that advice in the light of the approvals of five Presidents of the United States, including President Truman, three New York State Governors, including Governor Dewey, two New York State Legislatures, five Boards of Engineers, two committees of Congress, a majority vote of the United States Senate in favor, the Maritime Commission, building and operating the world's wonder fleet, the Department of State, War, Navy, Commerce, and Agriculture. These judgments expressed by national and State agencies invested with a wide public interest can be measured against this individual employee of a commercial body in a single port. The

Federal Government has already properly spent in the improvement of New York harbor more than half the total cost to our Government of operating the St. Lawrence now with its score of great cities waiting for it. Sounds selfish, doesn't it?

This Association has always been backward on the St. Lawrence project. Let us see what has happened on this half century.

On power, even 30 years ago, the total generated power of America was 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1934 when this Association opposed the project before Congress, America used 90,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1941 when this Association again opposed this project and stated that power was not needed, America generated 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Last year, America used 240,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The greatest power-operated industrial Nation, because of such opposition, sees today, flowing unused to the sea, the cheapest source of power remaining in America, more than the T. V. A. total improvement. In the 4 years since 1941 association opposition, the population of the Northeastern United States has actually shrunken almost 5 percent. At what stage would this association change its views?

In these same 4 years more than half the national expenditure in new plants and plant expansion has centered around the Great Lakes cities. From the management genius and the swelling pool of skilled labor flowed the miracle industrial production that saved the world.

If the St. Lawrence had in 1934 been approved by only 15 additional Senators there would have been saved untold lives and unnumbered ships over the protected St. Lawrence route during the critical years since Pearl Harbor.

America was not built by men who oppose and object, but by men of courage and faith in America's growth, magnificently justified especially in these last 4 years of war. Men in this National St. Lawrence Association like Owen D. Young, Edward P. Noble, John Cowles, Cyrus Eaton, Henry Ford II, Marshall Field, Jay N. Darling, C. B. Thomas, Bernard Ridder, Murray Van Wagener will continue to ask of Congress fair play in presenting the weighty reasons for congressional approval and firm in the faith that opening a fourth seacoast in the war industry heart of America will not so much divert tonnage and commerce from other ports and railroads, but rather create a great upsurge in industry, employment, and earnings, marking a new and brilliant chapter in America's world leadership.

Sincerely,

JULIUS H. BARNES,

Member of Commerce and Industry  
Association of New York.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 3109, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3109) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Senate," at the top of page 2, to insert:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum, to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties (including expenses for travel, lodging, and subsistence while away from his State domicile in the performance of his official duties) to be paid in equal monthly installments. Such allowance shall not be considered as income for the purposes of Federal, State, or other law, and such expenses, to the extent that they exceed such allowance, shall be deductible for income-tax purposes if otherwise authorized by law. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, \$353,667, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 3, 1945, to June 30, 1945, both inclusive, shall be immediately available.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this amendment will require some time for explanation, and it is a controversial amendment. Therefore I suggest that it be passed over for the time being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 3, line 7, after the word "and," to strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$2,000"; in line 22, after the word "clerks" and the dash to insert "one at \$3,900"; on page 4, line 6, after the word "each", to insert "additional clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office, '\$4,020';"; in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "assistant in library, \$1,440" and insert "two assistants in library at \$1,800 each"; in line 11, after the word "messenger", to strike out "\$1,260" and insert "\$1,320"; in the same line, after the words "one at" where they occur the first time to strike out "\$1,980" and insert "\$2,040"; in line 12, before the word "five", to strike out "\$1,620" and insert "\$1,680"; in the same line, after the words "five at", to strike out "\$1,440" and insert "\$1,500"; in the same line, after the words "one at", to strike out "\$1,380" and insert "\$1,440"; in line 13, after the words "Secretary's office", to strike out "\$1,680" and insert "\$1,740"; in the same line after the word "one" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "\$1,560" and insert "\$1,620"; in line 14, after the word "one", to strike out "\$1,260" and insert "\$1,320"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$153,920" and insert "\$165,720."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we know on what page the amendments appear which are now being agreed to? The amendments are read so fast I have not been able to find where they are.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The last amendment agreed to appears on page 4.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Document Room," on page 4, line 19, after the word "laborer", to strike out "\$1,380" and insert "\$1,440"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$19,220" and insert "\$19,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Committee Employees," on page 5, line 4, after the figures "\$4,800", to insert "assistant clerk, \$3,600 for the office of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by him;"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 13, after the figures "\$2,220", to insert a semicolon and "additional clerical assistance at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 15, after the figures "3,900", to insert "assistant clerk, \$3,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 18, after the figures "3,900", to insert "assistant clerk, \$3,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 24, after the figures "2,220", to insert a semicolon and "additional clerical assistance at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$6,000."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask what is the purpose of these appropriations which it is proposed to make to the majority and the minority conferences of the Senate? For what purpose is that money supposed to be used? What are the clerks and assistant clerks supposed to do? Is it simply the setting up of political organizations within the Senate itself? And why should public money be expended for that purpose, if that is the purpose?

Mr. OVERTON. That is the question which is before the Senate. The amendment was offered by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Perhaps he would prefer to explain it.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it is to be understood, first, that the regular minority conference clerks described in the bill are the personal clerks who are assigned to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. As the Senator from Michigan he receives his allowances just as if he were a committee chairman instead of receiving them as an individual Senator. So, most of these clerks in this list are his personal office force. The additional \$6,000 is sought for the purpose of the direct clerical assistance to the minority conference. I think it does not provide for any more than are now there, but I have assigned one of my clerks and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has assigned one of his clerks. I think there are now one research clerk and two stenographers. They are to be covered by the \$6,000. It seems proper that the cost should be charged directly to the minority conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Are these extra clerks and assistants additional to the regular clerks which the chairmen of the ma-

jority and minority conferences are allowed as Senators?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, as Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. They are additional?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Michigan, by reason of being the chairman of the minority conference receives \$3,840 more than he would receive if he were merely a Senator from Michigan and not the chairman of the conference. That \$3,840 he is willing to assign plus the \$6,000, which would bring the total altogether to about \$9,800, which covers I think about four clerks who are assisting the research assistant.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the Senator from Michigan, and the majority chairman, who I presume is the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]—

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Would receive about \$18,000 a year more for clerk hire because of being chairman.

Mr. TAFT. Not \$18,000. To be exact, the Senator from Michigan would receive \$9,840, in addition to what he receives by virtue of the fact that he is a Senator from Michigan. The \$9,840 would be for additional clerical assistance.

The same condition exists in every committee of the Senate. I think the existing system is a very poor way to handle the problem; but every committee chairman is assigned a certain number of clerks, and no distinction is made between his personal office force and those who serve the committee. It is up to the chairman to decide how much clerical assistance he will assign to the committee, and how much he will keep in his office. I think it is a poor system.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. We discussed that question with the committee. We felt that if we were to undertake any general reform, the two activities should be separated. Every Senator should have his individual clerks, and each committee should have the clerks necessary to do the committee work. But so long as the present system exists, this seemed to me to be the best way to handle this particular situation.

So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he will receive exactly what he receives as a Senator from Michigan, and the \$9,840 which he would receive in addition would be used to provide an office force for the minority conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the additional money proposed to be assigned to the majority and the minority to hire clerks to keep up with their politics?

Mr. TAFT. No; to keep up with the research work, which is very valuable. This work is being done continuously, and is of great value to the minority. In some cases the results of the work are placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and made available to all Senators. As a matter of fact, much of the research work done is available to any Democratic Senators who wish to have it. So far as I know, there has been nothing secret about it up to this time. It has been something that we could get directly and quickly, and from the point of view from which we wished to have the particular problem studied.

Mr. AIKEN. What research work is done that the Library of Congress would not willingly do?

Mr. TAFT. A Senator can call up the Library of Congress and have certain formal research work done. I should say that this particular research work is done very much better, and very much more reliably. It is approached from the particular point of view of the members of the minority conference. I have heard no criticism whatever of the work done, and I have heard nothing but praise for the assistance which has been rendered to Senators who have availed themselves of it.

Mr. AIKEN. The research work should be on a wholly impartial basis. Otherwise, public funds may be used for partisan or propaganda purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator believe that all research work is done from a particular standpoint? A Senator may say "I want to get the arguments on this side of the problem, or on that side of the problem, or on both sides." Those who are asked to do the research work are usually willing to do it, no matter from what point of view the work is approached. Suppose the Senator's charge were true. I do not know how many Government bureau research workers are approaching the thing solely from a political standpoint. There are probably a thousand times as many as the three clerks who might be assigned to the minority conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have made no charges that I am aware of. I am simply questioning the advisability of adding \$6,000 each to the appropriations for the majority and minority leaders, without having a pretty good idea that the money is to be well spent, and in the public interest. I do not see why it should be spent for any other purpose than in the public interest. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How does this amount compare with the amount which the late Senator McNary had available?

Mr. TAFT. The amount is exactly the same as the amount which Senator McNary had, except for the additional \$6,000. As the Senator knows, the work now covers a somewhat broader field. As I say, we have actually used these clerks. I have assigned one to the minority conference, which I cannot afford to do permanently. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has assigned one clerk, which he cannot afford to do permanently. It seemed proper that they should be paid for directly by the Senate, instead of by individual Senators.

Mr. LANGER. Is it proposed to appropriate \$6,000 additional for the majority leader as well?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose the Senator from Ohio should tell one of the research assistants that he desired data to substantiate one side of a question, and the Senator from North Dakota should tell the same clerk that he desires data to support an argument on the other side



of the question. Would both Senators be entitled to make their requests?

Mr. TAFT. Both of them would receive what they requested; and if the research worker were asked for his opinion, undoubtedly he would give his opinion, which might be either way. He would be likely to be a man of very set opinions of his own. However, it would be clear that his opinions were his own, and not those of anyone else.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to leaving the appropriation as it is at present, but I do not think we should appropriate \$6,000 additional of public money for this purpose. The majority leader could use his allotment to promote the cause of the majority party, and the minority leader could use his to promote the cause of the minority party, and the public would pay the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it depends very largely on the viewpoint. Year after year we appropriate, not a few thousand dollars, but millions of dollars, for clerical help in the executive agencies and departments in Washington, and not a single objection is raised. But when an effort is made to assist the United States Senate and United States Senators in the discharge of their legislative duties, and a small appropriation is asked for that purpose, very frequently objection is heard.

So far as I am individually concerned, I believe that we ought to be better equipped than we are with able clerical help. I see no reason why the majority conference and the minority conference should not have the small sum of \$6,000 each for additional clerical help.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a question. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Ohio to say that the information gathered by these research assistants is available to any Senator?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I would say that, because one of the purposes of asking for such information, and one reason for having a minority force, is to obtain a confidential report which is not available to everyone unless it is desired to make it available. Most of the information which has been obtained has been available to all Senators. Every committee chairman in the Senate can use one of his clerks to make a partisan research study, and can keep it confidential if he wishes to do so. If he can do so, why should not the chairman of the minority conference and the chairman of the majority conference have the same privilege? I do not understand the Senator's point of view. I do not understand his criticism of this proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that every Senator can have his clerks do research work for his own political benefit. He has an appropriation for that purpose. If every Senator, including the majority and minority leaders, has an appropriation for clerks and can use it for that

purpose, what is the sense of having an additional appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. Because we can have better work done, especially if our own clerks are busy. Incidentally, Senators are not given any allowance for a real research clerk. The clerks in his office are so busy with his own work that he cannot always afford to assign them to research work. At least, he cannot afford to employ an individual or a force with sufficient breadth of knowledge and ability to study all kinds of problems, which we can do if we combine in an effort to get the work done.

Mr. AIKEN. Has there been any complaint on the part of Senators that they could not get that work done by their own office forces?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and there has been great satisfaction with the work which has been done.

Mr. AIKEN. There is some dissatisfaction with some of the work that has been done, or is going to be done.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know what the Senator can tell about what is going to be done.

Mr. AIKEN. Too much of this money has been used for propaganda purposes.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say. I will vote against the proposed appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 24.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Gurney	Overtown
Barkley	Hart	Pepper
Bilbo	Hatch	Revercomb
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Burton	Hoey	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Wagner
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ellender	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
George	Murdock	Wilson
Gerry	Myers	Young

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from

Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are absent on official business for the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on official business for the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, has been designated to visit the Philippine Islands and, therefore, is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent, by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business, by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent on official business of the Senate, as members of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent by leave of the Senate, on official business of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained in committee meeting, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum because I should like to have a record vote on this amendment, which proposes to give \$6,000 a year to the majority and minority leaders for clerk hire, in addition to the \$9,000 or \$10,000 they now have for that purpose. It looks to me as if the additional \$6,000 asked for is simply for political purposes. I do not think it should come out of the public funds, when it would be used for party political purposes. I have no objection to leaving the appropriation as it now is, but I do not believe we should allow the extra \$6,000. I hope the Members of the Senate will be willing to go on record regarding how they feel about the additional appropriation. Therefore, I have asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and I were willing to have our positions on this amendment recorded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, in line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, in line 4, after the figures "\$2,220", to insert a semicolon and "additional clerical assistance at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$6,000"; in line 10, after the figures "\$3,900", to insert "assistant clerk, \$2,880"; in line 11, after the figures "\$2,220", to strike out "additional clerk, \$1,800" and insert "two additional clerks at \$1,800 each"; in line 16, after the figures "\$3,900", to insert "assistant clerk, \$3,600"; in line 17, after the figures "\$2,220", to strike out "additional clerk, \$1,800" and insert "two additional clerks at \$1,800 each"; in line 25, after the figures "\$3,900", to insert "assistant clerk, \$3,600"; on page 7, line 3, after the figures "\$2,580", to insert "assistant clerk, \$2,400"; in line 4, after the figures "\$2,220", to strike out "additional clerk, \$1,800" and insert "two additional clerks at \$1,800 each"; in line 11, after the figures "\$2,220", to insert "assistant clerk, \$2,040"; in line 22, after the figures "\$2,220", to insert "assistant clerk, \$2,040"; in line 23, after the figures "\$3,900", to insert "special assistant, \$3,300"; on page 8, line 2, after the figures "\$2,220", to insert "two assistant clerks at \$1,800 each"; in line 6, after the figures "\$3,900", to strike out "assistant clerk, \$2,400" and insert "two assistant clerks at \$2,400 each"; in line 15, after the figures "\$2,400", to strike out "assistant clerk, \$2,220" and insert "two assistant clerks at \$2,220 each"; in line 18, after the figures "\$2,000", to insert "assistant clerk, \$1,800"; in line 20, after the figures "\$3,900", to insert "assistant clerk, \$1,800 and \$1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; on page 9, in line 3, after the figures "\$1,800", to insert "Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$1,800"; and in line 8, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$515,140" and insert "\$587,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clerical assistance to Senators," on page 9, line 14, after the word "each" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD, I desire to make a statement in respect to the additional

clerks to whom the Senate is now addressing itself.

As Senators know, these additional clerks are not new clerks; they have been on the Senate roll, but they have been paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate in accordance with a resolution which was reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. At the opening of the present session that committee reported resolutions with respect to these additional clerks and provided that the period of their employment should expire on June 30 of this year. The committee did so for the express purpose of having such additional clerks carried as permanent clerks in the appropriation bill now being considered, if the Senate desired that to be done.

I make that explanation in order that Senators may understand that no additional offices are being created.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9 in line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 15, after the word "Senator", to strike out "from each State having a population of 4,000,000 or more inhabitants, \$90,720; and \$4,020 per annum for each Senator from each State having a population of less than 4,000,000, \$315,560 in all, \$404,280" and insert "\$493,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana to refer back to the amendment beginning in line 15 on page 10. Am I to understand that the plan of affording ex officio clerks to Senators representing the larger States is to be changed?

Mr. OVERTON. No; that is not correct. We have left undisturbed the additional clerical help furnished to Senators representing the larger States; but it will be remembered that when the Senate originally made that provision at the last session of Congress we added certain clerks for the remaining Senators. For the purpose of supplying additional clerks we made a distinction between clerks of Senators who represented the larger States and clerks of Senators who represented the smaller States. We see no reason why there should be a distinction between those additional clerks in respect to their salaries.

Mr. BYRD. The Senators representing the larger States receive additional clerical assistance, as I think they should.

Mr. OVERTON. They receive such assistance.

Mr. BYRD. The provision to which I have referred on page 10 would not disturb that situation?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield let me say that, as I understand, this amendment eliminates the ceiling which may be observed with respect to the compensation paid to clerks so that their compensation does not depend upon the population of any State.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. After providing for additional clerks to Senators from the larger States, the Senate last year provided an additional clerk for each Senator regardless of the population of the State which he represented, whether it be a State of large population or a State of small population. We are now fixing the compensation of those additional clerks from all States, large and small, at the same rate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I mean.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 3, after the word "Senators", to strike out "\$1,567,080" and insert "\$1,646,640: *Provided*, That all clerks, assistant clerks, and additional clerks under this heading shall be ex officio clerks, assistant clerks, and additional clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper", on page 12, line 20, after the word "majority", to strike out "\$2,280 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent" and insert "\$2,640"; in line 23, after the word "minority", to strike out "\$2,280 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent", and insert "\$2,640"; on page 13, line 7, after the word "one", to strike out "\$2,040" and insert "\$2,220"; in the same line, after the word "upholsterer", to strike out "\$2,040" and insert "\$2,220"; in line 11, after the word "passage", to strike out "\$1,740" and insert "\$1,800"; in line 13, after the word "at", to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,560"; in line 15, after the word "at", to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,560"; in line 16, after the word "chief", to strike out "\$2,460 and \$280 additional so long as the position is held by present incumbent" and insert "\$3,000"; in line 17, after the amendment last stated, to strike out "fourteen at \$1,620 each" and insert "assistant chief, \$2,400; thirteen at \$1,800 each; longevity pay of operators as authorized by Public Law No. 2, Seventy-ninth Congress, \$1,350"; in line 21, after the word "space", to strike out "\$1,200" and insert "\$1,260"; in line 25, before the word "each" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "\$1,560" and insert "\$1,620"; in the same line, after the words "two at", to strike out "\$1,440" and insert "\$1,500"; on page 14, after the words "two at", to strike out "\$1,440" and insert "\$1,500"; in line 3, after the words "one at", to strike out "\$1,320" and insert "\$1,380"; in the same line, after the amendment last stated, to strike out "twenty-seven at \$1,260 each" and insert "twenty-six at \$1,320 each"; in line 4, after the words "three at", to strike out "\$480" and insert "\$540"; and in line 7, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$272,484" and insert "\$279,494."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, are all these employees under the classified civil service?

Mr. OVERTON. To what item is the Senator referring?



Mr. BYRD. I was referring to the laborers provided for on page 13.

Mr. OVERTON. No; the employees under the Sergeant-at-Arms are not under civil service.

Mr. BYRD. Are any of them affected by the bill which was passed last week increasing the salaries in the classified civil service? I know that janitors and others were affected.

Mr. OVERTON. Those employees whose salaries are to be increased in this bill were not taken care of in the bill passed a few days ago.

Mr. BYRD. We are not being asked to change any salaries which were affected by the bill which was passed last week covering employees of the legislative branch of the Government; are we?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 9, after the word "Captain", to strike out "\$2,700" and insert "\$3,000"; in the same line, after the word "at", to strike out "\$1,740" and insert "\$2,000"; in line 10, after the word "at", to strike out "\$1,740" and insert "\$2,000"; in line 11, after the word "at" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "\$1,680" and insert "\$1,920"; in line 12, before the word "each", to strike out "\$1,620" and insert "\$1,800"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$105,480" and insert "\$117,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Post Office," on page 14, line 15, after the figures "\$2,280", to insert "assistant, \$1,740"; and in line 17, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$56,460" and insert "\$58,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Folding room," on page 14, line 20, after the word "incumbent", to strike out "clerk, \$2,400; clerk, \$1,740" and insert "clerks—one at \$2,400, two at \$1,740 each"; in line 22, after the figures "\$2,040", to strike out "fourteen" and insert "thirteen"; and in line 23, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$29,340" and insert "\$29,640."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 16, line 15, after the word "labor", to strike out "\$372,962" and insert "\$401,762."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 21, after the words "by law", to strike out "\$9,376.66" and insert "\$10,249.66, and the maximum allowance per capita of \$96.66 is increased to \$105.66 for the fiscal year 1946 and thereafter."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question with respect to the amendment in line 8, on page 14, in fact the entire paragraph beginning in line 8, dealing with the salaries of the Capitol Police force. I should like to know how the salaries of the Capitol Police force compare with the salaries of the police force here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. The salaries of the Capitol Police are substantially lower than the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, to such an extent that it has been very difficult to obtain policemen and officers for the Capitol Police, and the salary is so low that the right of patronage exercised by Senators with respect to members of the Capitol Police force is now very rarely taken advantage of, because men from the different States are unwilling to come to Washington and work at so meager a compensation.

We have done the best we could. We have provided a rather slight increase, not so large an increase as was suggested, but we felt that, on the whole, we were doing substantial justice or at least we were improving the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to have that explanation. I hope that at some time we can have a police force for the Capitol which will be in keeping with the dignity of the Congress and that money may be provided to pay them compensation to which a good police officer is entitled. Some day, as a member of the Rules Committee, I hope to make some kind of a report dealing with that subject. As I have observed from time to time the workings and operations of the police force in the Capitol, it has sometimes occurred to me that they perform public service commensurate with the pay received.

I am not speaking in any disrespect of any man on the Capitol Police force; but I definitely feel that they are all underpaid and that there should be established a more rigid and efficient system that would make the Capitol Police force an enforcement agency that would receive the commendation of all visitors who come to the Capitol.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to say now with respect to the observation made by the Senator from Illinois concerning the Capitol Police that the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate stated to the committee that he has a very efficient police force; that he has no criticism to make of it; and that they are very attentive to their duties. I may say in this connection that their duties are not so light as might be indicated by the observations made by the able Senator from Illinois. They have a great responsibility and they have considerable territory to cover, including all the buildings and grounds around the Capitol, and they are constantly vigilant and on the alert. Mr. Romney, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, intimated that if the compensation of the Capitol Police could be increased he thought he could obtain more efficient policemen on the House side.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not complaining so much about the manner in which the Capitol Police perform their duties; in fact, one of the members of the police force is from Illinois. I know he is a capable and competent officer. I am complaining primarily, more than anything else, about the salaries these men are now paid in comparison with the salaries paid members of the Metropolitan Police force of this city and other

cities. I think that the duties of the Capitol Police force around the Capitol, so far as responsibility is concerned, are just as heavy as and more important in many cases than the responsibilities of policemen on regular beats here in the city.

Mr. OVERTON. I quite agree with the Senator. However, I did not feel personally like urging too great an increase, because in acting as chairman of the subcommittee I was acting in a substitute capacity. The regular chairman of the subcommittee was absent, and I did not wish to advocate too many and too large increases in the salary rates.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 6, after the word "resolution", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That whenever any person has left or leaves any civilian position in any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government in order to accept employment by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, he shall be carried on the rolls of such committee and shall be solely employed by such committee, and responsible only to it; but he shall be entitled upon making application to the Civil Service Commission within 30 days after the termination of his employment by such committee (unless such employment is terminated for cause) to be restored to a position in the same or any other department or agency where an opening exists, comparable to the position which, according to the records of the department or agency which he left to accept employment by the Senate Committee on Appropriations or in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission, such person would be occupying if he had remained in the employ of such department or agency during the time he was employed by such committee; and such person shall be restored to such position with the same seniority, status, and pay as if he had remained in the employ of the department or agency which he left, during such time. This section shall not be construed to require any person to be restored to a position in any department or agency after the expiration of the time for which he was appointed to the position which he left to accept employment by such committee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 11, after the name "Senate", to strike out "the initial 3-minute toll charges on not to exceed 10 strictly official long-distance telephone calls from Washington, District of Columbia, per month for each Senator", and insert: "toll charges on not to exceed 26 strictly official long-distance telephone calls, aggregating per month for each Senator not more than 130 minutes, to and from Washington, District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 17, to insert:

There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee

to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls originating and terminating outside of Washington, District of Columbia, not to exceed \$300 per year for each Senator.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 2, after the name "Senate", to strike out "\$26,900" and insert "\$46,300: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1946 the allowance for stationery for each Senator and for the President of the Senate shall be \$400 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds," on page 38, line 22, after the numerals "1941", to strike out "\$317,200" and insert "\$331,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to reserve the right to offer an amendment on page 19, lines 16 to 25, inclusive. I desire to reserve the right to move to amend that provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be in order after the committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I merely wanted that to be understood.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado will have the opportunity to offer an amendment.

The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 24, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$349,500" and insert "\$339,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library of Congress," on page 43, after the word "Librarian", to strike out "\$1,777,000" and insert "\$1,783,310."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments except the first committee amendment on page 2, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning at the top of page 2 it is proposed to insert the following:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum, to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties (including expenses for travel, lodging, and subsistence while away from his State domicile in the performance of his official duties) to be paid in equal monthly installments. Such allowances shall not be considered as income for the purposes of Federal, State, or other law, and such expenses, to the extent that they exceed such allowance, shall be deductible for income-tax purposes if otherwise authorized by law. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, \$358,667, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 3, 1945, to June 30, 1945, both inclusive, shall be immediately available.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a number of Senators desired to know when this amendment, relative to the congressional expense allowance, would come up. I stated to them that I would suggest the absence of a quorum. Although there is a very full attendance of the Senate at this time, in order that other Senators may be present—

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it the intention of the Senator to proceed with this amendment this afternoon?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes, indeed. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Gurney	Overt
Barkley	Hart	Pepper
Billbo	Hatch	Revercomb
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Burton	Hoey	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Wagner
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ellender	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
George	Murdoch	Wilson
Gerry	Myers	Young

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I announce again the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in attendance upon public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning at the top of page 2.

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to call the attention of the able Senator to the last two paragraphs on page 18. The first paragraph deals with toll charges for telephone calls made by Senators to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, under the control of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which the Senator from Illinois is chairman. I think I thoroughly understand the change which has been made in paragraph 1 with respect to toll charges which each Senator may incur, but with respect to paragraph 2 I am not certain. Paragraph 2 reads:

There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls originating and terminating outside of Washington, D. C., not to exceed \$300 per year for each Senator.

In paragraph 1 it is provided that each Senator may make "not to exceed 26 strictly official long-distance telephone calls" from his home to Washington, if official business, or from Washington to his home, if official business. It is stated that in addition to those telephone calls there shall be paid from the contingent fund "toll charges on strictly official long-distance calls" terminating outside

of Washington, D. C., "not to exceed \$300 per year."

That paragraph provides that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate shall lay down the rules controlling the expenditure of the \$300. Am I to understand that each Senator must keep an itemized account of each and every telephone call that is made, or at the end of the year will the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be directed to pay each Senator the sum of \$300?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not understand it would work that way. I think it would operate just as the present system does, a practice with which the Senator is familiar, that is, that the telephone company would make note of the charges, and when the \$300 was exhausted then, of course, that would end the Senator's allowance with respect to telephone calls outside of Washington.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the telephone company is to keep the books for each Senator with respect to these telephone calls?

Mr. OVERTON. That is my understanding, and if that be found, after consultation by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with the representatives of the telephone company, to be a burden that is unbearable, then the other alternative would be for the Committee to Audit and Control to establish, by rules and regulations, the requirement that each Senator keep an itemized statement of his long-distance telephone calls outside of Washington, and not directed to his office in Washington.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for the explanation, but there is still some doubt in my mind, under the wording of the amendment, whether at the end of the year a Senator would not be entitled to the difference between \$200, let us say, charged for long-distance calls he has made, and the \$300, which would mean \$100, which would have to go to him.

It is obvious to me that telephone companies cannot keep the records as suggested by the Senator from Louisiana. I am certain each Member will have to keep an itemized report and submit it to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for approval. That is, providing Senators are not entitled to the maximum amount of \$300.

Mr. OVERTON. No; a Senator would not be entitled to withdraw any money whatsoever; in fact, it is not contemplated that he would pay any money. It is contemplated that the charge would be made against the Government. But if that be found to be too impracticable, then another arrangement can be effected by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and whatever arrangement may be effected will of course be agreeable to the Senate, and must be agreeable, under the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. President, we have for consideration now that provision of the bill which may be designated as the congressional expense allowance provision. A similar provision originated in the House of Rep-



representatives, and it may be well, before beginning a presentation of the merits of the amendment and some of the reasons which actuated the committee to recommend its adoption, that I should point out the differences which exist between the House provision and the proposed Senate amendment.

The House provision is to be found on page 19 of the bill, and reads as follows:

There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties to be paid in equal monthly installments.

Then follows the necessary appropriation. The Senate committee provision carries the language contained in the House provision, with the changes necessary with respect to the designation of Representatives and Delegates and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, substituting the word "Senators."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD. Does the House provision require the submission of an itemized statement of expenses and an explanation of the same?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. That is my personal interpretation of it. Of course, the House would be in better position to give an interpretation of the provision than I am. It is a congressional allowance for the House, and the House legislatively determined that the average congressional expenditure which would be allowable under this provision would amount to the sum of \$2,500.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator regard that as being nontaxable?

Mr. OVERTON. In my opinion it is not nontaxable. In my opinion the language of the House provision makes the \$2,500 taxable.

Mr. BYRD. The language in the Senate provision corrects that, and makes it nontaxable?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator thinks that is a correction?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senate did not undertake to interfere at all with whatever the House desired inserted with respect to its own membership. That is a rule of comity which, so far as I know, invariably has existed between the two Houses. The House is not disturbed at what the Senate does with reference to its own employees or its own body. The Senate, on the other hand, does not interfere with such provisions peculiarly applicable to the House which are made by the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is there any evidence other than the language used in the amendment to indicate whether the House thought it was making this item nontaxable?

Mr. OVERTON. There is a statement in the report made by the House committee. The House committee took no evidence. The Senate committee, on

the other hand, had evidence before it concerning which I shall make observations later on.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of the language contained in the report the House was informed and believed that it was passing a nontaxable item?

Mr. OVERTON. It did. The House Appropriations Committee stated in its report:

Since this item is entirely for expenses incidental to office it would not be income, therefore not taxable.

In addition to retaining the House language the Senate committee in its suggested amendment specifically includes among the expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of a Senator's duties, the following:

Expenses for travel, lodging, and subsistence while away from his State domicile in the performance of his official duties.

And then it contains the following additional language which is not found in the House provision:

Such allowance shall not be considered as income for the purposes of Federal, State, or other law, and such expenses, to the extent that they exceed such allowance, shall be deductible for income-tax purposes if otherwise authorized by law.

Then follows the necessary appropriation which, insofar as the Senate is concerned, amounts for 18 months to the sum of \$358,667.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is meant by the phrase "if otherwise authorized by law"? I do not know of any law which authorizes a Senator or a Member of the House to engage in any particular expenditure to the extent that it is authorized by law, and I do not understand that phrase. In other words, if an individual Senator spends more money than the \$2,500 provided for, it is deductible if it is authorized by law. Under what law is that?

Mr. OVERTON. Under the revenue law. The revenue law provides for certain deductions, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not provide for any deductions on the part of Members of Congress. It provides for deductions on the part of everybody else, but—

Mr. OVERTON. I think that in the main the Senator is correct, but not altogether so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the phrase "if authorized by law" mean that the deductions are authorized by law or that the expenditures exceeding \$2,500 are authorized by law?

Mr. OVERTON. Deductible expenditures are allowed. The deductions from the income tax of certain expenditures are allowed by law.

Mr. BARKLEY. As we all know, the Treasury Department has never been willing to make any deductible allowance for expenditures incurred by Members of Congress in the performance of their duties, even in connection with matters that are directly in line with their duties. For instance, if we travel

to various places to make speeches for or otherwise engage in Government bond sales, and in behalf of the Government to urge people to buy bonds, which most of us are probably going to do in the next few days at our own expense, that is in line with our duties, and we are glad to do it, but we get no deduction for income-tax purposes for that expenditure, whereas if anyone from the Treasury Department goes out to do that he is given the deduction. He also has his expenses paid. I wonder whether the phrase to which the Senator has referred "if authorized by law" means if the deduction is authorized in the revenue laws, or whether the expenditure is itself authorized by law.

Mr. OVERTON. The deduction is authorized by law.

Mr. BARKLEY. It refers to the deduction.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. I now read from the report submitted by the Senate committee:

The allowance will not be considered as income for income-tax purposes and if expenditures are made in excess of the allowance for items otherwise deductible under the law these items will still be deductible.

I thoroughly and heartily agree with the able Senator from Kentucky that, according to the rules of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, there are very few items which they recognize as deductible insofar as Representatives and Senators are concerned. I shall give as an illustration, long distance telephone calls. All long distance telephone calls made in the discharge of a Senator's duties are not covered by the provision now existing, but under the provision adopted by the committee they will be considered deductible. I say they will be considered deductible, but the vagaries of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are many when it comes to applying the law to Senators and Representatives, as I shall undertake to show shortly. The Bureau did allow a deduction to be made because when Senator REED, of Pennsylvania, was in the Senate he had inserted in the revenue law a provision to the effect that expenditures made in the discharge of the official duties of a Senator should be regarded as deductible. So, the Bureau has heretofore been allowing a deduction for certain telephone charges.

I give that as an illustration. But in order to point out their inconsistency and, I think the severity of their ruling, it developed in the course of the hearing that they now hold that if Senators make any additional calls they cannot deduct them because the Congress has in effect declared that only a certain number of telephone calls may be made by a Senator.

I agree with the Senator from Kentucky; and I shall undertake to show in the course of my remarks that I think the rulings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue have been rather harsh when it comes to Senators and Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the effect of the language "and such expenses, to the extent that they exceed

such allowance, shall be deductible for income-tax purposes if otherwise authorized by law." If they were otherwise authorized by law to be deducted, they would be deductible. Why do we have to say it again? Is that language intended to change what may be deducted? What is the purpose of inserting that language?

Mr. OVERTON. The purpose is this: Under the present rulings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, no expenses for travel, maintenance, and subsistence are deductible so far as a Senator or Representative is concerned. So if we allow the \$2,500 and provide that such allowance shall not be considered as income, then if the expenditures which we make for maintenance, travel, and subsistence are in excess of \$2,500, they will not be deductible. Therefore, in order to make them deductible, we must legislatively declare that they are deductible.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but as I understand the present law as interpreted—and presumably correctly—they may not be deducted.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Therefore they are not "otherwise authorized by law." So I do not see that this sentence changes the situation in any way. This language seems to me to say that they can be deducted if they can be deducted; and I do not understand how the language would change the present law.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand the Senator's point. Unless we were to say "if otherwise authorized by law" we could then deduct expenses which would not be deductible under the law, and could deduct them ad libitum. We would then far exceed what is contemplated, namely, an allowance of \$2,500 for senatorial official expenditures. Then, when we enter the realm of uncontrolled deductions, we would probably be doing something which, as legislators, we would not want to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean, then, that if the expenses referred to are the type of expenses which would ordinarily be regarded as a business expense if incurred by others, they may be deducted? For example, I refer to such things as telephone calls, traveling expenses, and similar items. Is that what the Senator means to imply by saying "if otherwise authorized by law"?

Mr. OVERTON. As I interpret the amendment, by the language "if otherwise authorized by law" the committee means as the law is interpreted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. It seems to me that the very clear meaning is that the deductible expenses of a Member of Congress are not necessarily limited to \$2,500.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. But if the actual expenditures exceed \$2,500, and are of such character as are now deductible, there may be a deduction in addition to the \$2,500.

Mr. OVERTON. I think that is perfectly clear; but what the Senator from Ohio wished to know was the reason for inserting the restrictive phrase "if otherwise authorized by law."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If I correctly understood the Senator, according to my recollection there are no expenses now deductible except, perhaps, telephone expenses. I do not know of any other congressional expenses which are deductible under the present law.

Mr. OVERTON. There may be others. None occurs to me now. For example, a Senator is granted a certain allowance for stationery. Suppose he should exceed the stationery allowance and had to buy more stationery, over and above the amount allowed for stationery. That expense would be deductible. A Senator is allowed certain other items. For example, he is allowed mileage in traveling to and from a regular session of the Congress once a year. If a Senator's expenditures should exceed the mileage allowance in traveling to and from Washington in attendance upon a regular session of the Congress, the excess could be deducted.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but suppose a Senator's expenditures for travel should exceed the amount which he now receives; namely, the regular mileage allowance for traveling to and from a regular session of the Congress. Although it might be necessary travel, he would not be entitled to a deduction for the additional expenditure. If he were to hire more clerks in his office to handle his mail than the allowance now authorizes—

Mr. OVERTON. He would be entitled to a deduction.

Mr. PEPPER. He would not be entitled to a deduction for that expenditure.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; he would. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. PEPPER. I never heard of such a deduction.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not know that such expenditures were deductible until I made an inquiry into the matter. We brought experts before the subcommittee and learned that there were little items here and there that were deductible. I think we have mentioned them all—additional clerical assistance, additional telephone calls, additional mileage, additional stamps, and additional stationery.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is now speaking only of the mileage allowance to cover expenses incurred in traveling once to and from a regular session of the Congress, is he not?

Mr. OVERTON. That is all that is allowed.

Mr. PEPPER. However, many Members of Congress of necessity travel between Washington and their homes a greater number of times during a session of the Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. That expense would be taken care of under the \$2,500 provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of what seems to be a difference in construction of the phrase "if otherwise authorized by law" I offer this suggestion: The language "if otherwise authorized by law" refers to deductions of expenses. The Senator might give consideration to the substitution of the language "if incurred in the performance of official duty" in lieu of the language now in the bill, so that if a Senator should expend more than the amount allowed in the performance of official duties, such additional expenses could be deducted. I offer that suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I would not object to such an amendment, except that then we would have an unlimited expense account which would be deductible. If we wish to take the position—and I believe we would be perfectly justified in doing so—that all expenses which Senators incur in the discharge of their official duties should be deductible, as they are in the case of every other employee of the Federal Government, then the suggested amendment would be entirely proper.

On the other hand, the committee did not feel that it should go quite that far. The committee amendment still makes a discrimination against Members of Congress, because it places a limit upon the deductible expenses which may be incurred in the discharge of official duties. That limit is \$2,500. However, if a Senator spends more than that, he can deduct the additional expense from his income-tax return, provided that the expenses are incurred in the discharge of his official duties, and provided also that the deduction of such items is authorized by law. The phrase "if otherwise authorized by law" simply means as the Bureau of Internal Revenue or The Tax Court may interpret the law.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, what this amendment proposes to do is to exempt entirely from the Internal Revenue regulations a lump sum of \$2,500.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. And to say that \$2,500 shall be deducted, regardless of what it is spent for. There would be no itemized statement. There would be nothing upon which the Bureau of Internal Revenue could pass. Is not that a new departure in taxation? Has that ever been done before? If so, I have never heard of it. We are allowed only certain deductible and itemized expenses. If the Senator desires to proceed along the line of this amendment, it seems to me that the amendment ought to state what are deductible items.

Mr. OVERTON. I will tell the Senator the reason. If we were to follow his suggestion it would make the Senator from Virginia an accountant. He would have to keep an itemized account of every nickel and dime.

Mr. BYRD. Does not everyone have to do that for his income-tax returns?

Mr. OVERTON. He can do it or not, as he wishes. But if he is entrusted with \$2,500, it is his obligation to keep an itemized account of it.



Mr. BYRD. But the Senator knows that one cannot make a deduction for purposes of income tax unless an itemized account or statement is kept.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not keep an itemized account of all such matters, but that is optional with me. When, however, I receive a fund as a trust, I must make an accounting of it.

Mr. BYRD. If, as the Senator says, we would not be compelled to keep itemized statements, and if we provided that we would be able to make lump-sum deductions, the income-tax law would be completely destroyed; would it not?

Mr. OVERTON. I think not. The Federal judges are allowed per diem and mileage allowances. Does the Senator think they make itemized statements of their expenditures, and that they return such statements? So far as I know, they do not.

Let us consider the situation as it would apply to a Senator from California. He is allowed mileage to California and mileage from California to Washington. Does he keep an itemized statement of all of his expenditures under it?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator is discussing an entirely different thing. In the instance to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, a Senator is not expected to keep an itemized statement. He is allowed that as a flat allowance. But he is expected to make an itemized statement when he makes deductions from his taxable income.

Mr. OVERTON. Exactly, and that is what we would do. We would give a flat allowance of \$2,500, to represent the expenditures of a Senator. If he wishes to make any deductions, for purposes of his income tax, for an excess over and above the \$2,500—which is entirely optional with him—then he should submit an itemized statement of what he expended.

Mr. BYRD. Then, Mr. President, in reality the Senator proposes to increase the salaries of Senators by \$2,500 and to make the \$2,500 exempt from taxation, because it would not be subject to any regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and no one would know whether the deductions were allowable.

Mr. OVERTON. That is a very strange interpretation, but it is not the purpose in any way whatever.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that it is the effect of the amendment, regardless of whether it is the purpose.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further until I can at least clarify the Senator's own mind. Then I shall be glad to yield.

What we would do would simply be to allow the \$2,500. We would not require an itemized statement to be kept. But if a Senator anticipated that he would use more than the \$2,500 in the discharge of his official duties and in expenditures which would be deductible items, then he would keep an itemized statement of the \$2,500 and of any excess expenditures he might make, and when the deputy collectors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue called upon him, to look over his income-tax return he would say, "Here they are; here are all the

expenditures I made." But he would not have to do it unless he wanted to make deductions for the excess.

I hope I make myself clear.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator hoped he would clarify the mind of the Senator from Virginia, but what he has said is exactly what the Senator from Virginia believed in the beginning.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, would the amendment make deductible anything which is not now deductible?

Mr. OVERTON. Indeed, it would.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean in addition to the \$2,500. Suppose my rent is \$3,000 a year. Would I be able to deduct the \$500 in excess of the \$2,500?

Mr. OVERTON. Not under this amendment. The Senator would be allowed the \$2,500 to assist in paying the expenses relating to the discharge of his official duties.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the amendment would not change or make deductible any item which is not now deductible—that is, leaving out the \$2,500?

Mr. OVERTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The general purport of the amendment is, of course, to increase the income of a Senator by \$2,500.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not so interpret it.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, let us put it this way: Under the present rules and regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue the legitimate traveling expenses of a Senator are not deductible; they are not deductible under the present arrangement.

Mr. OVERTON. That depends; there is some qualification to that rule.

Mr. BUTLER. But if the pending amendment is adopted, we will be providing what the rule of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall be with reference to the \$2,500.

Mr. OVERTON. We would be providing what the law would be.

Mr. BUTLER. I wonder whether it would not be more consistent with good business rules to provide by law that the Bureau of Internal Revenue should look upon the expenses of a Senator in the same way as it does the expenses of a traveling salesman for a flour mill or for any other business concern. We would thereby place ourselves in the same category as that which legitimate business is in, instead of trying to increase our income by a scheme of this kind.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator has expressed an opinion. Is he asking me for a reply?

Mr. BUTLER. Could we not just as well provide that the expenses would be deductible?

Mr. OVERTON. I think I can answer that question and a number of other questions if I am able to proceed for a little while without interruption, and thus undertake to present my view of the situation. Of course, I am glad to yield at any time. I do not think the pending question is so important, but it excites considerable interest, politi-

cally and otherwise. Consequently, I shall be very glad indeed to answer any questions which may be asked.

The amendment would place United States Senators in the same category and classification as other Government employees and the judges of the Federal courts. All the employees in the executive departments have their expenses which are incurred in the discharge of their official duties paid. If an employee of an executive department goes to Colorado and back again in the discharge of his official duties, compensation is paid to him for the expenditures he makes. If a subordinate in the Office of Price Administration desires to telephone to San Francisco, Calif., he picks up the telephone and engages in a 15- or 20-minute conversation, and the Government pays for it, regardless of the number of calls he may make.

I am indebted to the very able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for the very careful study he has made of the uncontrolled expenditures made by executive agencies and departments of our Government. He submitted an illuminating report on May 20, 1943; and if it is not the last word, at least it will suffice for what I am about to say. Let us consider traveling expenses. For the 6-month period between July 1 and December 31, 1942, the Department of Agriculture spent for traveling expenses \$5,175,796, or more than \$10,000,000 a year.

The Department of Justice spent three - million - four - hundred - thousand - and - some - odd dollars, or at the rate of approximately \$7,000,000 a year; the War Production Board, at a similar rate of approximately \$7,000,000 a year; the Federal Security Agency, at the rate of approximately \$4,000,000 a year; the Office of Price Administration, at the rate of more than \$3,500,000 a year. That is to be found on page 5 of the committee report submitted by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. On page 4 of that report will be found a long list of the various agencies within the Government, together with the amounts which they expended for travel during 1941 and 1942.

I summarize the situation in the language of the Senator from Virginia:

According to the figures submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, a total of approximately \$35,672,000 of a nonmilitary nature—

Nothing whatsoever to do with the bill—

was spent on travel expenditures in the 6-month period between July 1 to December 31, 1942.

That is at the rate of more than \$70,000,000 a year. Yet a suggestion has been made that a United States Senator should be asked to make a trip in the discharge of his official duties to Baltimore, Md., for instance, employ a conveyance for that purpose, and that he may make no reduction in his income-tax return, and that he may receive no remuneration from the Federal Government to reimburse him for the expenses to which he has been put.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator contend that no Senator has ever been allowed remuneration for expenses while traveling on official business?

Mr. OVERTON. I do.

Mr. BYRD. Many Senators are reimbursed for their expenses while on official business. All members of committees who have been traveling to various places have been reimbursed for their expenses.

Mr. OVERTON. That is true; but only in connection with special appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. I care not whether it be by a special appropriation or what it may be. The Senator is giving the impression that no Member of the Senate is ever repaid for his expenses in connection with official business.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the general rule. Every Senator is subject to the general rule unless the Senate graciously, through its Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, allows some amount for the payment of expenses of committee members in the discharge of certain official duties.

Mr. BYRD. Standing appropriations are available from which Senators may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of their official duties. There can be no question about that.

Mr. OVERTON. That is true; and from time to time money has been appropriated for such purpose. But I am thinking, for example, of this situation: I went home 2 or 3 weeks ago when the flood in my State was at a terrific height, and the people were calling upon me to come there and look at the flood and undertake to help them. I went there. I could not be reimbursed for the expenses to which I was put, and the expenses were not deductible from my income-tax return. When the people who are interested in the apple-growing business in Virginia perhaps hold a convention and ask the junior Senator from Virginia to come and address them in reference to some particular regulation of the Federal Government, for example, and he accepts the invitation, he can make no deduction in his income-tax return for the expenses to which he has been put. However, if a subordinate in a branch of the executive department of the Government goes on a trip in connection with his duties he is reimbursed for his expenses. As the Senator from Kentucky pointed out a few minutes ago, there may be a problem connected with tobacco growing, or a problem which is vital to the agricultural interests of his State; but, if he goes to his State in connection with such problem he must pay his expenses out of his own pocket. Yet, according to the report of the Senator from Virginia, more than \$70,000,000 has been spent by various executive agencies, and the Senator is objecting to \$380,000 being spent by Senators in connection with their official duties.

Mr. BYRD. I object to the method which the Senator is suggesting. I object to the fact that he has not provided for itemized statements to be filed by the Senators. He is suggesting an innovation in the tax laws. The Senator also

knows that he cannot make a flat deduction in his income-tax report without itemizing for what the money was spent.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not care whether it is an innovation or not. I shall never vote that a Senator must make a detailed and itemized statement of the \$2,500 expense allowance.

Mr. BYRD. Why should a Senator be superior to anyone else? Every other taxpayer in the United States must make itemized statements in connection with deductions which he claims when he files his income-tax return?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator from Virginia object to the actual expenses incurred by Senators or Members of the House of Representatives in the discharge of their official duties being properly deductible from their income-tax returns?

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I would not object to it. I think it would be entirely proper if the expenses were clearly defined, properly deductible, and itemized in accordance with the usual procedure in connection with the income-tax laws.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Louisiana will further yield to me, I may say that I propose shortly to offer a substitute which will provide that the actual expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties shall be deductible items.

Mr. BYRD. And itemized, so that a statement of the expenses will be presented?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. The expenses would have to be shown, of course, as having been incurred in connection with the discharge of a Senator's official duties.

Mr. BYRD. I perhaps would be in favor of that.

Mr. HATCH. I also propose to vote for the language of the committee authorizing an allowance of \$2,500. I think the necessary expenses should be paid.

Mr. BYRD. I am opposed to increasing the allowance greater than 15 percent, which has been the effect of the wage-control program. I am opposed to increasing compensation of Senators more than we have increased the compensation of hundreds of thousands of civilian employees by the bill which was passed last week.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I would rather not yield. We are becoming diverted to a discussion of an amendment which has not yet been offered, and I have not yet had an opportunity to present the committee amendment completely to the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia has said that we are getting away from the Little Steel formula. The Little Steel formula has nothing more to do with the subject which we are discussing than has the meat on the Senate restaurant tables. Compensation of Senators and Representatives—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that according to the morning newspapers, there is no meat on Senate restaurant tables. [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may we have order? This matter is important. If we want to make a joke out of it, very well; but if we wish to consider it seriously, I think we should proceed to do so.

The present compensation of \$10,000 to Senators was fixed in 1925. It has not been increased since. According to the record of the hearings held at the time, in 1925 the average weekly earnings for factory or industrial workers was \$25.71. In the month of February of this year, 1945, it had increased to \$47.33, or an increase of more than 84 percent. Therefore there is absolutely no relation between the expense allowance for Senators and the Little Steel formula.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the case of the white-collar workers there was no increase to speak of before the 1st of January of 1941, and from that time on it has been frozen to 15 percent. Very few of the millions of white-collar workers are permitted by the Senate today to get more than a 15-percent increase. I cannot defend myself justly to the people of my State that I today am holding them down to 15 percent—and there are hundreds of thousands of them in Ohio who are particularly under the salary clause; not so much the industrial workers, for they did not have the early increase the others had—I cannot defend giving myself a larger increase than those people have had, and I do not see how we can reconcile one situation with the other.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Ohio, I think, is making an erroneous argument. The white-collar workers are allowed their expenses; they are reimbursed their expenses. We are not by this amendment asking for an out-and-out increase of \$2,500.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERTON. Allow me for a moment to say something about this amendment which the committee has charged me with the duty of presenting to the Senate. In this amendment we undertake to reimburse Senators for what we legislatively undertake to declare is an average expenditure for travel, maintenance, and lodging. That is all we do except that if we spend more than \$2,500 and if we desire to do so, we can deduct the excess from our income taxes. But the white-collar workers have been having their expenses paid all the time and are still having their expenses paid; Senators have not.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator the meaning of a provision of the amendment. I assume when it says "including expenses for travel, lodging, and subsistence" it does not mean the expenses of a Senator's family, for instance?

Mr. OVERTON. It does not.

Mr. TAFT. Therefore a Senator would have to separate his rent and live-



ing expenses from those items incurred by members of his family and charge only that portion that could be attributed to him as an individual. Is that a correct interpretation of the provision?

Mr. OVERTON. It is not necessarily a correct interpretation at all. I think that where there are besides the Senator other members of the family he should make a calculation and so far, for instance, as subsistence is concerned, that is the meals served, he should obtain credit for his proportion of the cost. Suppose there were three in the family; then the Senator would make for his subsistence a deduction of one-third of the expense; but if there are, say, two in the family, he and his wife, and they occupy a modest room with a little kitchenette, he would deduct for the total rent, for if the Senator were a bachelor he would occupy the same quarters or if he left his wife at home he would still occupy the same quarters.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment in order that I may ask him one other question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose a Senator owns his house here—and today it is necessary for some Senators to buy houses in order to have a place in which to live—I do not suppose he could charge anything for lodging under those circumstances, unless the language of the section were changed. Is that a correct view?

Mr. OVERTON. I have given some thought to that. I think he could in that case. It is not his regular home; his home is back in the State, and that is property that he uses in furtherance of his business, and so he could make a deduction for taxes, depreciation, and repairs and the usual deductions that are allowed in the case of other property not occupied as a home by the taxpayer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the last time?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I myself only feel as to the deduction of expenses, that, if there is to be one, I should much prefer a provision permitting the deduction of a per diem for the time spent in Washington. It is not quite fair to say for one thing that all the expenses in Washington are additional expenses. A Senator has to keep up some of his expenses at home, but he certainly saves a very large amount by reason of being here 6 months at a time. His house at home is closed; he has probably no food expenses and no family expenses at home. Therefore the principle of deducting every cent of expenses incurred in Washington is not sound and just. I think it is fair to make some allowances for that, but I do not think it ought to be the entire expenses, and I certainly do not think it ought to include directly or indirectly any family expenses. I think the provision as it is drawn is open to that interpretation or at least to doubt.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire to comment on the situation which has arisen because of which Senators—and I am dealing now only with Senators but it applies to Members of the House of Representatives as well—cannot make any deduction for rent, subsistence, or maintenance in the District

of Columbia, when any businessman or any professional man who comes from his home to the District of Columbia can make deductions for travel expenses, for his maintenance, his subsistence, and his lodging. I may say that some such persons occupy very palatial quarters in the magnificent hotels that adorn our Capital City. Some of them reserve large suites at high prices, but the Internal Revenue Department permits them to deduct every dollar which they spend. Some of them live when they are here on the very best of the hotels and restaurants can afford. They eat the finest meals—caviar, oysters a la Rockefeller, poulet en Rochambeau, and every conceivable kind of magnificent dish served in course dinners, that can be served. All such expenses are deductible in the case of others, but not one cent may be deducted by a Senator. That is a strange circumstance, is it not? Why is it? It is because the Internal Revenue Bureau place the most remarkable interpretation on the law which the Congress has enacted. Here is what the Internal Revenue Code declares:

Section 23. Deductions from gross income. In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions:

(a) Expenses.

(1) In general.

All the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business, including a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered; traveling expenses (including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging) while away from home in pursuit of a trade or business.

The Internal Revenue Code declares that the term "trade or business" includes the performance of the functions of a public office. Therefore, within the intendment of the law, while we are here in the Senate, we are conducting a trade or business, that is, we are in the performance of the functions of a public office.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, while on that point, I understand that deductions are given businessmen for the expense of maintaining boats on rivers and upon the sea merely for the purpose of entertaining their business guests.

Mr. OVERTON. For anything spent in the furtherance of their business. They can give parties, and, if they are advertising parties, deduct the expenses. As the Senator says, they can have boats and take boat trips and excursions, and deduct the expenses. They can pay fabulous sums for advertising over the radio, in newspapers, and deduct them. But if a Senator engaged in a campaign should dare to deduct one cent of his campaign expenses, they would not be allowed. Let a Senator undertake to make any other deduction in connection with his official duties, except the few paltry items I have mentioned, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue says, "Nay, nay, that cannot be done." Yet, according to the report of the Senator from Virginia, they allow more than \$70,000,000 a year for the different executive departments.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERTON. One minute. I have not quite finished with the Senator's re-

port. Let me say to the Senator it is one of the most illuminating reports—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERTON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERTON. I ask for order. [Laughter.] Let me quote from the able Senator from Virginia, who has made such an intense study of economy in government, and yet, so far as I know, has accomplished nothing, because the millions upon millions of dollars we appropriate for the different departments and agencies continue to pile up, and the Senator does not, in connection with any appropriation bill I have heard of—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. No; not until I give the Senator this quotation from the report. The Senator from Virginia does not raise his strong and able voice in order to strike down the appropriations which are made for traveling and subsistence expenses for various executive agencies.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator should yield to me on that subject.

Mr. OVERTON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator wants to misrepresent the Senator from Virginia—

Mr. OVERTON. I shall give the Senator ample opportunity to correct himself.

This is what the Senator says on page 1 of his report, to which I have referred. I have not said anything about communications, a subject into which the Senator goes—that is, in connection with telegrams and long-distance calls. The Senator starts out with this statement:

Based on totals of the 6 months' period between July 1, 1942, and January 1, 1943, it is possible to estimate that the total travel and communication expenditures—

He itemizes the travel expenditures to be more than \$70,000,000. Now he brings in the communications.

The total travel and communication expenditures for the executive branch of the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1943 will exceed \$100,000,000, excluding the War and Navy Departments.

Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I realize fully that any man who has stood for economy in the Senate is often the subject of ridicule, as the Senator from Louisiana has tried to ridicule me today, but when he says that I have not offered amendments to reduce these appropriations he speaks without a knowledge of the facts. It is true I have not had the assistance of the Senator from Louisiana, as powerful as that assistance would be, because he is a member of the great Committee on Appropriations, of which I am not a member. I have repeatedly offered amendments to reduce traveling expenses and I have offered amendments whenever I thought they stood one ghost of a show of being adopted, and I expect to continue to do so, even though they might not meet the approval of my beloved friend—and he still is and always will be—the Senator from Louisiana. I think we should cut down these expenditures in Washington, and I do not care who derides me in my effort to do it.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to interrupt the able Senator a moment. It was never my intent to ridicule the Senator. I have too high a regard and affection for him. I thought the shoe was on the other foot, not that he is trying to ridicule me, but he twitted me about this amendment the committee has reported.

Mr. BYRD. I assure the Senator the affection is reciprocated, and always will be.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I merely wish to make clear the point that in reading the report made by the Senator from Virginia for the economy committee, and made for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that too much money is spent for travel, the Senator is taking the position that that is deductible from the income taxes of these employees. That is a perfect absurdity. These expenditures—

Mr. OVERTON. I did not say they were deductible.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; the Senator did, and the RECORD will show that he mentioned it as a deduction from their income taxes.

Mr. OVERTON. If so, I certainly will retract the statement. I never would make the absurd statement that when an employee is reimbursed for his expenses he can likewise deduct them.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to interrupt the Senator only briefly, because while I am opposed to his amendment, I have not made any statement which would reflect in any way on the distinguished Senator. I am opposed to the amendment for what seem to me to be good and sufficient reasons. I cannot imagine a greater mistake on the part of the Senate of the United States than to increase the salaries of Senators, and then make the increase tax exempt.

The Senator says he is putting Senators on an equality with the departmental heads, or the departmental officers and employees who travel. Is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. In the same category; yes.

Mr. BYRD. What the Senator's amendment says is this, "including expenses for travel, lodging, and subsistence while away from his State domicile."

Mr. OVERTON. I have not been able to present that matter yet, and I would rather the Senator should not anticipate me, but let me present it, because I have never reached that point.

Mr. BYRD. Let me finish my question. The Senator said his amendment places them on an equality. The Senator inserted the words "State domicile" to protect Senators, because there are thousands and hundreds of thousands of employees throughout the Nation who have State domiciles outside of the place where they do their work. Does the Senator contend that the expenses of a department head should be paid here in Washington by the Federal Government if he has a State domicile, let us say, in Louisiana?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall reach that point directly. I have not gotten to it yet.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has just said, has he not, that the amendment he proposes puts the departmental heads, the department bureau chiefs, whatever we may call them, on an equality with Senators?

Mr. OVERTON. That it puts Senators on an equality with them.

Mr. BYRD. It puts Senators on an equality with the Government officials. In order to do that, we would have to allow such officials and employees expenses while they are in Washington.

Mr. OVERTON. I have not yet reached that point. I shall answer the question.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has not reached it, but it is in the Senator's amendment, and I should like to have him explain that, because it is a very important point.

Mr. OVERTON. I was about to reach that when I was interrupted.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator uses the words "State domicile" because he wants to protect Senators. He knows the domicile of Senators must be in the States, because they cannot be elected if they are not in the States. Then he wants to pay their expenses while they are away from their domicile.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me proceed in regular order.

Mr. BYRD. I shall not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. OVERTON. I want the Senator to make his argument in his own time.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator does not desire to be interrupted, I shall not interrupt him further.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall reach the points suggested by the Senator from Virginia, but I should like to make my statement in my own way. I am perfectly willing to yield to any Senator who desires to ask a question for information, but I should like to have the Senator state his opposition in his own time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to know where a United States Senator lives. I have been informed by the Revenue Department that a Senator lives in Washington.

Mr. OVERTON. That is his home.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not believe any such thing. I do not think he could be elected if he lived in Washington. I do not believe he could continue to have membership in the Senate if that were a fact. We are not permitted to deduct any of our expenses in making up our income tax returns because, I understand, the revenue department says we live here.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. The statute declares very clearly that what are deductible are "travel expenses—including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging—while away from home in pursuit of a trade or business," or in the discharge of a public function or office.

"While away from home." What interpretation does the Bureau of Internal Revenue put on the words "away from home"? When a businessman comes to Washington from his State, he is away from home; when he goes into another

State, he is away from home; when he goes 10 miles away, he is away from home; but when a Senator comes to Washington from the State which has elected him, it is said, "You have come home, Mr. Senator." When he goes back to his own State which elected him, he finds himself, under the ruling of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, a stranger in his own State.

I want to show the Senate how ridiculous that ruling is. The ruling is based on this proposition: The Bureau says that the United States Code Annotated contains this provision:

All offices attached to the seat of government shall be exercised in the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere, except as otherwise expressly provided by law.

Since, therefore, Members of the legislative branch cannot enact measures into law except in Washington, their home is in Washington, and when they are away from Washington they are away from home, and when they are here in the District of Columbia they are back at home.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Tax Court, as it is now called, have overlooked a provision of the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps that is customary these days; perhaps it is strictly a la mode. Not only those in the Bureau of Internal Revenue but a great many others overlook the Constitution of the United States, which has fallen somewhat into decadence. But the Constitution of the United States in the second paragraph of section 2 of article I, provides:

No person shall be a Representative who shall not \* \* \* when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

The Constitution with meticulous care, made provision with reference to the domicile of a Senator, when it provided:

No person shall be a Senator who shall not \* \* \* when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he has been chosen.

So the Constitution fixes the home of the Senator in the State from which he is elected. Yet it is said that that provision is not correct, and that when a Senator leaves his State and comes here to Washington he is not incurring any expense in the discharge of his official duties, but he is going to home sweet home. That is the ruling of the Bureau.

Although I believe it had nothing at all to do with Senators or Representatives, I think a ruling made by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals is a correct one. A lawyer has his home in Jackson, Miss. He spends most of his time in Mobile, Ala., where he conducts his law practice and where he largely receives his income because he is employed by a client there from whom he receives a lucrative income. His obligation to his client requires him to stay most of the time in Mobile, Ala. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals declared that his expenses while going to his law office in Mobile, Ala., and his travel and his maintenance and his subsistence were deductible from his gross income.

On the other hand, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decided the very oppo-



site in a North Carolina case. In North Carolina there is a judge who lives some distance from Raleigh, the State capital. He is obliged to go to Raleigh twice a year to hold a term of court. The circuit court of appeals in that case, following the rulings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, held that when he left his home, where he had his family, where he lived, and went to Raleigh, N. C., to hold court, he was, in the language of the statute, going home because that was the place for him to discharge his official duties.

Mr. President, I have undertaken to present the main points in connection with this matter. It is not a salary amendment at all. If it were a salary amendment, it would simply provide that the salary of a Senator shall be \$12,500 a year, and there would be nothing in reference to income-tax provisions contained in the amendment. It is intended as an expense allowance amendment, and the Senate, as did the House, concluded that most, if not all, Senators do spend in Washington during these long sessions extending throughout the year as much as \$2,500 a year for rent, for meals, and for travel. If they do not spend that much, they are leading a life of stern economy, shall I say? I think they ought to be encouraged to live with sufficient dignity here in the Nation's Capital City to spend \$2,500 a year for their lodging, their maintenance, and there must be considered also under this item their travel expenses, except such as are paid to them by the Federal Government under the mileage allowance.

It is therefore, Mr. President, an expense allowance, and it places, as best the committee could resolve the problem, Senators in the same category and classification with all other employees of the Federal Government, including the white-collar employees whom the Senator from Ohio mentioned, as well as the judges of the courts.

Mr. President, there is no reason why we should not do this. There is no reason why there should be such rank discrimination against Senators and Representatives. There is no reason, at least none exists to my mind, why the Bureau of Internal Revenue or any court should hold that the home of a United States Senator or Representative is in Washington, D. C., instead of in the State from which he is elected. Their entire ruling which establishes us in a place entirely by ourselves, and makes us bear all our expenses, derives from their interpretation of the phrase "away from home" as it appears in the revenue law.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am about to offer a substitute for the committee amendment. I understood that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] had promised to have a quorum call. Would he rather have it now, or wait until I have finished?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not wish a quorum call unless a vote is imminent. I have thought that this matter might be considered, and that some compromise might be effected, and that perhaps we would not reach the voting stage on any phase of it this afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Maine and other

Senators that there will be no vote this afternoon on the amendment or on the substitute, because I think it is a matter of such importance that we ought to give it a little further study, in the hope that at least an effort will be made to draft language which will be more acceptable than apparently the language of the committee amendment is. So I hope we can continue to debate the question, but I do not think we shall be able to vote on it today.

Mr. WHITE. In those circumstances, I have no purpose of making the point of no quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I believe there should be a greater attendance of Senators to hear the substitute about to be proposed by a very able Senator. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Bailey	Green	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Guffey	Overton
Barkley	Gurney	Pepper
Bilbo	Hatch	Revercomb
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Burton	Hoey	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tobey
Chandler	Lucas	Walsh
Chavez	McClellan	White
Cordon	McKellar	Wiley
Donnell	McMahon	Willis
Eastland	Moore	Wilson
Ellender	Morse	Young
Fulbright	Murdoch	
George	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his courtesy in yielding to me at this time.

Mr. President, I find that I must leave the Chamber for the remainder of the afternoon. I had thought that the Senate would reach a vote on the pending amendment this afternoon, and I had hoped that I might cast my vote on it; but I shall have to be away from the Senate tomorrow and for several days. Inasmuch as the Senate will not vote on this amendment until tomorrow, I will not have an opportunity to cast my vote on it.

Mr. President, a great deal can be said in favor of the pending amendment. There is much merit in the proposal. We all know that today it is most difficult for Members of the Congress to meet their necessary expenses and their cost of living out of their present salaries. Particularly is that true in view of the present income-tax rates.

Mr. President, I assume that no Member of the United States Senate is in greater need of the benefits of the proposed legislation than I am. I am ready now to vote for an increase in salary for myself and for my colleagues, to take effect at the time when the Stabilization Act expires. In other words, I recog-

nize, and I believe the people of the Nation recognize, that there is justification for the Congress to adjust upwards the salaries of its Members. I do not think the majority of the people would object; I think they expect it; but so long as we have the present wage restrictions remain in effect, whereby the so-called white-collar workers—the clerks in the stores, the bookkeepers, the accountants, and other clerical workers cannot receive an increase in salary by reason of laws which the Congress has enacted, I believe that we, as Members of the Congress, should not, either by subterfuge or directly, pass any measure which would increase our salaries or our incomes or inure to our benefit insofar as a salary increase is concerned, until such time as we can make the same law or the same rule applicable to every citizen alike.

Certainly, Mr. President, sacrifices have been made during the period of the war, and every one of us knows that the white-collar workers and the wage earners in such capacities have suffered more than anyone else. Therefore, I am not willing, by means of an expense account or otherwise, to increase my salary until we can accord to them the same adjustment. When that time comes, I shall be ready to join with my colleagues, and to face the issue squarely, and to vote for an increase in salary appropriate and commensurate with the positions we hold and the economic conditions of the country. I am ready to do that and ready to have my vote recorded.

As I have said, Mr. President, there is merit in the proposal. It is justified from every standpoint except one, namely, the one I have just pointed out, for by this amendment we would be taking care of ourselves but we would leave without benefit of an increase millions of wage earners—workers who are just as deserving and who are suffering under present conditions just as much as we ourselves are. Until we can carry them along with us, I do not believe we are justified in taking this course of action.

Therefore, Mr. President, if I were present tomorrow I would vote against the pending amendment.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is much in what the Senator from Arkansas has just said. However, we are not confronted with a theoretical situation whereby we may postpone meeting the issue until some future date. The issue is here today; we must meet it today. We cannot postpone it until some future time, and we might just as well face it.

As a matter of fact, the House of Representatives has already met the issue. Regardless of what the Senate may do, under the provisions of the bill which have not been changed, which have not been amended, and which will not even go to conference unless we make some amendment here, Members of the House of Representatives will receive an increase of \$2,500 a year. If the pending amendment is rejected, Senators will not receive that increase. That is the reason why I say the issue is before us and we cannot avoid it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself do not regard the question of comity between the two Houses as going so far as to permit the Members of one House to draw larger salaries than the Members of the other House draw, no matter under whatever guise it might be proposed. My feeling is that if the amendment is rejected—and probably I shall vote against it—I should also vote to strike out the provision for the House of Representatives, which would make the same allowance for the House, because the comity between the two Houses has always required that their Members draw the same salaries.

I am ready to adjust the salaries, not only Members of Congress, but of the judiciary and others, but I will not vote to have the Members of one House draw more salary than the Members of the other House draw. I would not do it for the Senate, and I would not do it for the House of Representatives.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Kentucky, and the question of comity does not disturb me at all. If the substitute which I am about to offer is adopted by the Senate, I propose to offer a similar substitute for the House of Representatives and put both the Senate and the House on exactly the same basis. Assuming that what the Senator from Kentucky has said is correct, namely, that the amendment offered by the committee relating to Senators will be voted down, very well. Then the Senator from Kentucky may move to strike out the House provision, and perhaps the motion will be agreed to. The Senate would thereby overrule the House in that regard.

Mr. President, it is not a very pleasant situation in which we find ourselves. Because it is not pleasant, on yesterday I tried hurriedly to draft a measure which I thought might meet some of the objections which have been not only raised in the Senate but in my own mind as well. First of all, I do not wish to be critical of the Senate committee. I think the committee did its best to meet the situation with which it was confronted, and that it did a very good job. I certainly do not want to be placed in the position of criticizing the committee, or casting any reflection of any kind upon the committee for the purposes which it had in mind. However, we might just as well be frank and honest. That is exactly what I am trying to do by the substitute which I am about to offer.

I do not know why, but for some reason I think the country has the definite idea that the Congress of the United States is trying to increase salaries of Senators and Representatives by subterfuge, disguise, and back-door methods. Whether that be true or not, I think that to adopt a provision which would substantiate the already-formed opinion to which I have referred, would give the Congress of the United States, deservedly or undeservedly, a very black eye. That is something which I wish to avoid.

Mr. President, long before the present emergency existed—

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator from New Mexico place the interpretation which he has given on the amendment suggested by the committee?

Mr. HATCH. I do not place that interpretation upon it, but others do.

Mr. OVERTON. I know that; but I do not think we should be yielding to misinformed public opinion. I do not think that politically, if the Senator will pardon me, so much importance should be attached to the influence of misinformed public opinion. I recall that when the "Bundles for Congress" movement attracted notice and the suggestion was made that we should beat a retreat because of the outcry and hullabaloo which had been raised with regard to it, I had the temerity to stand on this floor and suggest that nothing of the kind be done. Last fall I was engaged in a campaign for reelection and my stand, as publicized all over my State, and in my broadcasts, was to pay no attention to the position which I had taken, except to say to those who mentioned it to me, "Yes; I assumed such position, and if you reelect me I will assume it again as soon as the opportunity arises." I lost no votes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has spoken today as he did at the time the "bundles for Congress" suggestion was made; namely, in a forthright, straightforward manner. I think that is what Congress should do today. I will join the Senator from Louisiana in making any kind of a straightforward declaration with regard to the situation of increasing salaries of Senators, and set aside specific amounts for expenses, or whatever they may be called. But let us call them by name, and say what they are, and then we can go forth and face the people regardless of any misinformed public opinion which may exist. However, I doubt very much whether the Senator from Louisiana or I can go before the country under the guise of an expense account and thereby increase our own compensation. I know that that is not the purpose of the Senator from Louisiana; but I also know that that is the thought throughout the country at the present time.

So, Mr. President, I have prepared the substitute amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment on page 2, line 1, it is proposed to insert the following:

There shall be paid to each Senator after January 2, 1945, an allowance of \$2,500 per annum for the purpose of increasing the compensation of Senators; to defray expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties and until a general readjustment of salaries and expenses can be made. Actual expenditures of Senators related to or resulting from the discharge of their official duties (including expenses for travel, lodging, and subsistence while away from their State domiciles in the performance of their

official duties) shall be deductible for income tax purposes. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, \$358,667, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 3, 1945, to June 30, 1945, both inclusive, shall be immediately available.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in explanation of the substitute I wish to say that it frankly declares, in the first instance, that the \$2,500 is for the purpose of increasing compensation of Senators and defraying their expenses.

It was said by the able Senator from Louisiana that expenses of Senators would equal \$2,500, or more. Possibly that is true. I do not know. In that case there would be no increase in the compensation of a Senator. But, while some Senators might spend \$2,500 or \$3,500, and it would be a legitimate item deductible from his tax income, others might spend only \$1,000. In the case of a Senator who had spent only \$1,000 he would have \$1,500 left, which would be clearly an increase in his compensation.

The substitute removes the provision which makes the allowance tax exempt. I assert, Mr. President, that I could never support the committee amendment which provides that the allowance shall not be subject to taxation. We in the Congress are charged with the responsibility of placing upon the people of this country a heavy burden of war taxation. We cannot escape, and we should not escape that responsibility. But, by the same token, when we place tax burdens upon every man and woman in this country, we certainly must bear our own share of the burdens, whatever they may be. Whether the increase in compensation be \$500, \$1,000, or \$2,500, that part which represents an increase in compensation ought certainly to bear its part of the tax burden of the country. Under my substitute it is proposed to assure that such shall be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator from New Mexico has made some progress in approaching this matter, but I wonder what he would think about another method of approach, which is slightly different from the one he suggests.

Mr. HATCH. I do not like any of the methods of approach at all, either that of the House, that of the committee, or my own. If the Senator has a better one, I should like to have him state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to make a proposal which is a sort of consensus or deduction from what has been said here this afternoon by those who have commented upon the subject. Generally speaking, I think all of us feel that Members of Congress are entitled to some increase in compensation, because an increase has not been made since 1925. A great many people in private employment have received some increase, which has been legitimized by a directive of the War Labor Board, and the Congress has provided for a percentage increase for all governmental employees.

Suppose we provided an outright salary increase for Members of Congress of 15



percent of their salaries. I cannot see how anyone could properly object to that. I do not know how the able Senator from Virginia might feel, but I inferred from his remarks a while ago that he did not think it would be objectionable if Congress merely increased its own compensation the amount allowed under the Little Steel formula, a figure comparable to what we have already provided for Federal employees. I do not see how anyone could criticize Congress for providing for itself the same percentage of increase which has been allowed private employees, and which has been allowed governmental employees. Let that be in one category.

Furthermore, I see no reason why we should not clarify the law relative to a Member of Congress being entitled to a deduction for what we might call a business expense, anything that is properly related to or arises out of the performance of the duties of the office of Senator or Representative.

If we clarified the law and the rulings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on that subject, and allowed ourselves deductions for what might be called business expenses, that would be a great boon to all of us, because we do not now, as a matter of fact, get such deductions. In my last income-tax report—if I may be personal—I did not claim any deduction whatever for any item associated with the performance of the duties of my office.

I think the able Senator from Virginia is absolutely correct in stating that every deduction we took should be corroborated by an itemized statement. If one traveled to his State on official business, he should put down transportation to Tallahassee, Fla., so much, Pullman so much, and meals so much, or travel expenses to and from Washington and Tallahassee, Fla., so much. A few days ago I went to Florida and addressed a joint session of the Florida Legislature at a memorial service for President Roosevelt. No one paid my expenses. Yet I am sure that no one would object to that being called an official expense.

Mr. HATCH. With all due regard to the ability of the Senator from Florida as an eloquent orator, which he is, would he have been invited to make that address if he had not been a Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I would not. I say, I think that is absolutely an official expense, because I went for the reason that I was a Senator. The legislature invited me because it was a legislative body. When \$150, the amount it cost to make a trip such as that, is taken out of a monthly salary of something over \$600, the amount we have left after taxes, it can be seen what it does to the family budget.

I cannot see how anyone could honestly criticize the Congress for doing the two things I suggest, yet if we did those two things it would mean to all of us a considerable boon, and I respectfully suggest to the able Senator the consideration of those two approaches to the subject.

Mr. HATCH. I am grateful to the Senator from Florida. I think he has made a valuable contribution. As I

stated, I have not been satisfied with the approach to this question either by the House, by the Senate committee, or my own. I have been perturbed myself. It is very likely that when the expenses are deducted—and I think this is what the Senator from Louisiana has in mind—there would not be an increase of salary which would amount to 15 percent. Is not that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct; it would not amount to 10 percent.

Mr. HATCH. And there would be no violation of what is called the Little Steel formula.

Mr. OVERTON. What the Senate committee was trying to do was to avoid requiring Senators to make an itemized statement with reference to their expenses.

I suggested to the committee with reference to allowing these deductions, an amendment providing that not to exceed \$2,500 could be deducted upon a certification made to the Secretary of the Senate. But there was objection to that. Senators seemed to think that if there were any difference between \$2,500 and what was actually expended, the difference would be so small there would not be any profit in it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A point of order, Mr. President. We cannot hear what is being said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. OVERTON. I was stating that the committee felt that if there were any difference between the actual expenditures of a Senator—and when I say expenditures, I mean such as those contemplated by the amendment—and \$2,500, the profit which any Senator would make out of the difference would be so insignificant that there would be no necessity of requiring him to render an itemized statement about the matter, and that it would be best to fix a modest lump sum, say \$2,500. That is the reason why we have done it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I wish to make one further observation.

Mr. OVERTON. On the other hand, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico would require that an itemized statement of all expenses be kept. I think the other solution is an easier one.

The suggestion made by the able Senator from Florida is subject to objection for a very different reason, that is, it might make the drain on the Treasury much higher than it would be under the amendment offered by the committee and the amendment suggested by the Senator from New Mexico, because in addition to giving the increase of \$2,500 he would allow all expenditures for maintenance, subsistence, and travel to be deducted from the income-tax return. So, a Senator might spend a thousand dollars a month on his lodging, and it would be deductible. No one could say to him, "You should have spent only \$200. You should not have spent a thousand dollars." He may live much more sumptuously than he would otherwise, because the item would be deductible.

Mr. PEPPER. That objection, which might be made, could easily be met by fixing a maximum that could be deductible, inserting some such language as this, "Provided, however, That total deductions shall not exceed \$2,500 a year." Will the Senator from New Mexico allow one further observation?

Mr. HATCH. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McLELLAN] has pointed out, we must consider sometimes not only what we do, but what the natural inference is from what we do. Yesterday afternoon I was meeting with the executives of 21 standard railroad brotherhoods, and when I started to leave one of those gentlemen said to me, "When you gentlemen start to increase your salaries tomorrow, I want you to remember whether or not you tried to put John L. Lewis in jail for getting some more money for the miners." He may or may not have been logical in the comment he made, but he made it, and he was honest in making it.

What I was about to say was that we are, however, entitled to deduct business expenses, that is to say, expenses which are correctly and naturally appropriate to the duties of our offices, and no one has a right to deny us that. We are entitled to the same percentage of increase others have had, which the Little Steel formula makes possible for them.

If there is a desire to limit the amount of the deduction, we could say, "Provided, That the total deduction shall not exceed \$2,500, or \$2,700, or \$3,000 a year," and that would be all right, but if we should do the two things I have suggested, we would meet the problem in a way which would be helpful to Members of Congress, and it seems to me it would stand the scrutiny of any fair criticism.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before I yield further I wish to say that I have been very desirous of obtaining a vote and completing action on the bill this afternoon, but when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and other Senators stated that there was no chance to obtain a vote today the plans which I had made of course went out the window.

Several Senators have expressed a desire to have me yield, and I am perfectly willing to yield and let them make such contributions to the discussion as they wish to make and perhaps work out some reasonable and intelligent solution to this problem on tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was induced to make the statement about not voting today because many Senators felt that if we could study the question overnight we might frame a provision which would apply to both Houses and be acceptable. Personally I should like very much to dispose of the matter today, but in view of that feeling I thought it might not be amiss to work on the problem during the time between now and tomorrow's session. Perhaps by tomorrow we can work out something which is acceptable.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the Senator did not think I was censoring him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all.

Mr. HATCH. I personally have a little engagement I wanted to keep; that is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to compliment the Senator on the effort he has made to solve this problem. I think that our difficulty in part grows out of the fact that the matter is being dealt with separately by both Houses.

Mr. HATCH. There is no question about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. There ought to be uniform legislation applying to all Members of Congress alike. We are injected into a situation where we must deal with the matter separately when it ought to be dealt with as a whole. We have a parliamentary situation which may result in the Members of one House getting what is equivalent to a \$2,500 increase in their salaries without the Members of the other House getting it, which would be something that has never before happened in the history of the United States and ought not to happen.

Mr. HATCH. I want to interrupt the Senator to say one word. As the Senator from Louisiana said, I think this is a serious matter. It is not a frivolous matter. We ought to devote our best efforts to working the problem out with the other branch of the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so, too. The House undoubtedly felt that this was not a matter of salary; that it was purely a matter of expense, and on the same basis as that of clerk hire, in which one House has not interfered with what the other House thought it should do respecting clerk hire for Members. Personally, I do not believe that is the sound basis for action which would justify each House dealing by itself. If it were, the Senate might even conceivably reduce the allowance for expenses to Senators, or increase the expense allowance, and leave the House provision as it is. So the Members of the two Houses would be upon a totally different basis in regard to compensation. That would be most unfortunate. If anything is to be done—and the House has injected this matter into the bill—I was hoping we might do something which would be acceptable to both Houses. I hope something can be done with the item one way or the other, or else that it be eliminated altogether. Perhaps by a little consultation and cooperation we can settle upon a plan by which the difficulty can be solved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that in the committee this amendment gave me a great deal of concern. I voted against the amendment which was reported. In trying to work the matter out along the lines we have been trying to follow in the case of the salaries of government employees generally, with an increase of about 15 percent, it occurred to me that the proper thing for us to do would be to take similar action for ourselves; and so my idea of the amendment which ought to be adopted is as follows:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 1, 1945, a salary of \$11,500 a year.

I realize that there is objection to such a proposal; that is that the House would probably not be willing to accept it. It

would make a difference between what the House has voted to its Members and what the Senate would vote for Senators. There would be that objection.

It seems to me we might reach a compromise respecting the first phrase of the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I am not tied to my own particular amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that, and that is why I am addressing myself now to the Senator from New Mexico. I am inclined to think it would be better if the Senator were to frame his amendment so as to read:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 1, 1945, a salary of \$12,500 a year.

If the Senator were to stop right there, and say nothing about expenses, and use no words in an attempt to legislate about the question of deductions from income, or anything else, but simply make the salary \$12,500 a year, and amend the House provision to that effect also, it would be better. If the Senator will further yield, I will give my reason for that suggestion.

Mr. HATCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would be a serious mistake, and I so stated before the committee, for the Senate to provide that a part of the salary of a Senator shall not be subject to income tax. I simply cannot vote for such legislation. Then, when we come to the question of making deductions for expenses, we find it to be very involved. Expenses are different with almost each and every Senator. Therefore, there is a very great objection to such a provision.

So I make the suggestion to the Senator from New Mexico for whatever he may think it to be worth. I hope the Senator will change the language of his amendment so it will read:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 1, 1945, a salary of \$12,500 a year.

Leave the language of the amendment with those words. Then we would not be subject to the charge of increasing our salaries by indirection. We could not be subjected to the charge of trying to escape income taxes which we ourselves have imposed. For that reason I believe an amendment such as that which the Senator from New Mexico has suggested, providing for an increase in salary of \$2,500, in view of the fact that the House has fixed upon that base sum, would probably be better, and I hope he and other Senators will consider what I have stated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I want to say a very brief word about the situation. It troubles me greatly. I am perplexed by the substantive provisions of the House draft of the amendment reported by the committee, and of the substitute offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I am concerned also because of the parliamentary situation which was presented to us, and which still is with us through the action of the House of Representatives.

I feel strongly opposed to any provision which exempts us as Senators of the United States from the general provisions of the tax laws of the United States. I do not myself want to vote and I do not want to see the Senate of the United States vote to put Senators in an exempted or an excepted or a preferred class under the tax laws of the United States.

Mr. President, I do feel that there ought to be some adjustment in the pay which is afforded Senators of the United States. I remember very well a good many years ago in the House, and I suspect it was in 1925, the year to which the Senator from Louisiana referred, that an able Member of that body laid down the rule, which I have always remembered, as to the pay of Members of the Congress of the United States. It was Ogden Mills, reputed to be a wealthy man, who said that the pay of a Member of Congress ought not to be so large that men would seek to come to the Congress of the United States because of the salary alone; that salary ought not to be the attraction which brings men into public life. Then he added that, on the other hand, the salary ought not to be so low that only men of independent means and wealth would be able to devote their lives to the service of the Nation in the legislative bodies.

I have always believed that this was a sound rule. Under the present circumstances, with all the demands made upon Members of the Senate and Members of the House, I do not believe that a salary of \$10,000 is an adequate payment to Members of Congress. I am perfectly willing to vote for an increase in the salary of both Senators and Representatives. That is not my first choice. If I could do as I pleased I would provide, first of all, for a sound retirement law for Members of Congress, a retirement law under which the beneficiaries would make contributions to the fund out of which payments were made to them. That would be the first thing I would do if I could have my will.

Next, I would meet the question of salary head-on, with no collateral questions of taxes or tax exemptions. I would meet it directly, pay adequate salaries, and then let Senators meet their tax obligations from their salaries, precisely as every other citizen does.

Coming to what I really had in mind to say when I rose, I believe that the suggestion of a recess, and conferences upon this question, is altogether wise. I believe that the majority leader should have an opportunity to confer with others who are interested in this subject, and who have given study and thought to the question. I hope there will be included in such conference the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I have a real faith that something can be worked out which will at least obviate some of the difficulties, and bring before us a legislative proposal for which we can vote in good conscience, and which we can incorporate into the law of the land. I hope the recess will be arranged, and that conferences will follow.



Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. I wish to make a few comments for about 5 or 10 minutes on the proposed amendment.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator proposes to discuss the pending proposal, does he not?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would prefer not to become involved in this controversy. However, this particular proposal involves issues which, for 2 years as a public member of the War Labor Board, I found it necessary to pass upon, so far as the wage-stabilization principles are concerned.

In my judgment, the proposal before the Senate constitutes a violation of the wage-stabilization policy of the Government, imposed upon industry and workers. I believe that the same wage-stabilization principles should apply to Members of Congress which they in turn expect the War Labor Board to apply to the population as a whole. It is only basic fairness that the same rules apply to the salaries of Congress as are applied to workers and salaried people generally.

I believe it is perfectly clear, no matter what language we use for terminology, that this proposal constitutes a salary increase for Members of the Senate. I agreed with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico when he refers to it as being clothed in language of subterfuge and indirection. I think it is a clear example of a subterfuge and an indirect means of increasing the "take-home" money, so to speak, of Members of the United States Senate. Later in my remarks I shall make a statement of my opinion as to the desirability of a salary increase for Members of the Senate at the close of the war; but for the duration of the war I believe that Members of the Senate should adjust themselves to the same wage policies which we call upon American employers and employees to adjust themselves to.

I believe that we should keep in mind the basic principles of the wage-stabilization policy as those principles relate to the Little Steel formula. I think we need to keep in mind the fact that it has been the policy of the War Labor Board, and still is the policy of the War Labor Board, to look at the rates of pay as of January 1, 1941, and compare those rates with the rates as of May 1, 1942. As the comparison shows that the workers concerned received a pay increase of 15 percent during that period of time, then they are not entitled to any further increase under the Little Steel formula.

Moreover, the War Labor Board has always sought to prevent evasions of the wage-stabilization program by voiding hidden or indirect wage increases granted after May 1, 1942, when such increases exceeded the Little Steel formula. I have sat through a great many cases and I am sure that Senators would be interested in knowing some of the various devices which employers and representatives of workers have attempted to

use in obtaining wage increases by indirection and subterfuge.

One of the most common devices was by way of the introduction into the plant for the first time of an expense account not theretofore paid or by way of paying bonuses. Sometimes these so-called bonuses were offered in the form of war bonds or free housing or other gratuities which had the effect of increasing the income of the worker or salaried official concerned.

I remember one case, which was somewhat humorous, in which we found that at Christmas time the employer proposed a substantial gift by way of subsistence, paying for a considerable food outlay. It would have amounted, of course, to a substantial increase in dollars and cents and amounted to a Christmas bonus. However before the war this employer was never so moved by the Christmas spirit. There was even one case in which the Board went so far as to say that gifts of turkeys at Thanksgiving and Christmas constituted a bonus and was recognized as a device to obtain manpower by way of an unauthorized wage increase. The Board ruled in such cases that the bonus was in violation of the wage stabilization program of the Government. It ordered that the employer should not be allowed to make such subterfuge wage increases. If prior to May 1, 1942, the granting of bonuses, expenses, and other gratuities was an established and fixed part of the wage structure of a given employer then he could continue to pay them after that date. However in a whole series of cases the Board has denied wage increases in the form of expense accounts which were not paid by the employers at the time the wage stabilization program went into effect.

In my judgment, what the Congress is attempting to do in this instance is to increase the income of individual Members of Congress by way of an expense account not paid by the Government at the time the wage-stabilization program became effective. Hence, I say that I think the amendment is an outright violation of the wage-stabilization program of the Government; and if the same rules were to be applied to Congress by the War Labor Board as Congress in turn expects the War Labor Board to apply to industry as a whole, the increase would have to be denied.

One of the most recent cases of the Board was a case with which I am sure many Senators are familiar. I refer to the Ohio telephone case. You will recall that in that case a telephone company struck upon the device of hiring girls in various towns and moving them to town Y and paying their living expenses in town Y. The War Labor Board held that when the company paid the living expenses of girls moved from town X to town Y, for example, it was guilty of violating the wage stabilization policies of the Government. The War Labor Board rightly called such an expense allowance a wage increase by way of subterfuge, and an attempt by indirection to undermine the wage stabilization program. Hence it ordered the

company to cease paying the expense account allowance.

I invite the attention of the Senate to Executive Order 9250, of October 3, 1942. That order followed President Roosevelt's great stabilization speech on April 27, 1942. I do not pretend to quote him exactly, but it will be recalled that in that speech his meaning and intent was to this effect: He said to every American citizen, "If you work for wages, those wages shall not be increased for the duration of the war, save and except under certain exceptional criteria." This criteria were set out in the speech. They related primarily to substandard wages, gross inequities, and wage increases necessary to aid in a more effective prosecution of the war.

Executive Order 9250 is so broad that it makes it perfectly clear that wage increases by way of bonuses, or by way of indirection through the payment of expense accounts not theretofore paid, would constitute improper wage increases within the meaning of the order and would be in violation of it if paid.

So I say that it is my sober judgment that when we test this amendment against the Executive orders now being applied by this Government under our wartime wage-stabilization program, it is a clear violation of them and if the War Labor Board had jurisdiction over the amendment, it would have to decree that the amendment provides for an improper wage increase by way of subterfuge.

The next point I wish to make, Mr. President, is with respect to the relation of the amendment, if adopted, to the whole problem of economic stabilization for the remaining period of the war. Certainly it should be unnecessary for me to plead at any great length for our doing everything which we as a Congress can do to maintain and protect the value of the American dollar. It would be a calamity for that dollar to become a cheapened dollar. We must not commit any act which will increase the danger of inflation in this country. Is it a stretch of logic to say that the adoption of this amendment by the Senate of the United States would start an inflationary spiral? I think not. I think not, if we will keep in mind how these great wage movements work; I think not, if we will recognize that those who are seeking to increase wages are always making use of arguments based upon precedents. What a great argument we would give them in their wage hearings before the War Labor Board if we were to put them in a position where they could say, "Well, the Congress of the United States, by indirection, by way of an expense account which this Board in specific cases has disallowed when it has involved private employers and private employees, has voted itself a wage increase of \$2,500, an amount far in excess of the 15 percent allowed by the Little Steel formula. We think we are entitled to at least as good treatment as Congress gives itself."

It would be a very persuasive argument, and I think it would be an argument to which members of the War Labor Board would have to give great heed. I know of no greater act of cruelty which we could commit against the workers

of this country than to take a step which would result in the cheapening of the American dollar. That is exactly what will happen if we do not succeed in the fight on the home front against inflation. I have said in a great many War Labor Board decisions—I said it for the first time in 1940, in the San Francisco ship clerks case, during the defense days, long before we went into the war, that "The time has come to make clear to the American people that pockets bulging with cheap money are always pockets close to empty stomachs." I repeated that statement in several decisions of the War Labor Board, because it is a statement of a principle of which we must not lose sight. If we permit the American dollar to become cheapened through inflation in this country, we shall be headed for the most disastrous depression, with resulting widespread unemployment and economic chaos, in the history of our country. I think that we, as the Congress, are guardians of the value of the American dollar. I do not think we should take any action in connection with the pending appropriation bill which could possibly provide a basis for an argument for a general wage increase in this country, because following such an increase there would be bound to be a corresponding increase in prices, and the old spiral would work in its historical cycle form, as it has throughout our economic history. Labor and farmers would be the greatest sufferers.

A very fine job of economic control has been done during this war. There have been weaknesses in it, and I have been critical of them; but by and large, I think, the stabilization boards which we have set up have done a magnificent job in protecting the real income of the American workers and consumers. There still are many wage injustices which need to be corrected, but I am confident that the War Labor Board can best do its job if we the Congress do not adopt a policy relating to our own salaries which violates the policies of the Board. If and when a general wage increase in excess of the Little Steel formula is needed to meet cost-of-living problems in the country as a whole, then I think the Board should be directed to make it universally applicable. However, I think that before we resort to such a wage policy a greater effort should be made to check and roll back prices, because I think that is the best way to protect the value of the consumer's and worker's dollar. In any event, we as guardians of the value of the dollar, should not grab an increase for ourselves and then expect the War Labor Board, Economic Stabilizer Davis and War Mobilizer Vinson to hold down the lid on the economic kettle already boiling with inflation pressure.

The third and last major point I wish to make in these extemporaneous remarks, Mr. President, is that I think we have presented here a problem which requires us, as Members of the Senate, to proceed to educate the American people in regard to the financial obligations and the financial costs which face the Members of the Senate. It is going to be a sad day for America if the Senate of the United States becomes just a rich

man's club. Yet, in view of my economic resources, I must confess that today a man has to have more wealth than I have, to serve in the Senate and do more than just break even. We need to inform the American people and give them evidence and facts as to the financial outlays inherent in service in the Senate. We need to make clear to them—as I am sure they will recognize, once they get the facts—that it is in the interest of American democratic government that we see to it that poor men can come to the Senate and can at least have reasonable security in their old age, after service in the Senate.

That is not the case today. I do not have to make an argument to you gentlemen to substantiate the point that service in the Senate, on the basis of the salary now paid, and in view of the costs and expenses which Members of the Senate suffer, makes it impossible for a Senator to develop any security for his own old age or any economic security for his family. Democratic government in this country will not remain healthy if that condition continues to exist.

However, Mr. President, our obligation, as I see it, is to collect the facts and frankly go before the American people, educate them to a better understanding of what is entailed in service in the Senate from the standpoint of expenses, and give them an opportunity, through public discussion, to pass judgment upon it. Then, when the war is over, we should come forward frankly, directly, and openly with a bill which provides that Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate be paid a salary commensurate with the responsibilities and in keeping with the duties and obligations of the office. A bill which will make it possible for them to retire from the House of Representatives or from the Senate with some decent security in their old age.

Let us be frank about it: Congress has suffered severe criticisms from public opinion in recent years because, rightly or wrongly—and I think rightly—the public has formed the impression that the Congress has sought to face its financial problem by indirection and subterfuge; and they do not like it. I do not think it is good for government in this country to have public opinion of the frame of mind that we are not willing to come to the public directly and openly and to say to the public, "Yes; on the basis of the obligations and expenses of the office, we need, we deserve, we are entitled to a salary which is decent and which will permit us to meet our expenses." My faith in the fairness of the people is such that I think they will insist that we raise our salaries after the war once they know the facts about our expenses.

I would suggest that when the war is over we ought to defend and we can defend a salary for the Members of both branches of the Congress equal to that of a Cabinet officer.

But until the war is over, as guardians of the value of the American dollar, as the ones who, after all, have a primary responsibility in protecting this country from inflation, as a Congress, we owe it to the people, in my judgment, to main-

tain strict controls over the economic life of this country until the supply of civilian goods balances the purchasing power of America. Until that time is reached, we owe an obligation to protect our people from the ravages of inflation. We must not be guilty of voting ourselves a wage increase by way of indirection and subterfuge which will violate the Little Steel formula, which will violate Executive Order 9250, and which, in my opinion, will be conducive to inflation in America. Hence, I am unalterably opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot conclude consideration of this bill today. I had hoped that we might be able to finish it tomorrow, and then adjourn over until Monday. If there is to be any effort made to perfect an agreeable and workable plan among ourselves, or with the Members of the other House, I doubt very much if it can be done by tomorrow. For that reason I intend to move that the Senate recess until Monday.

I wish merely to make this observation in connection with the entire situation: I feel very deeply that it is most unfortunate that this issue has come to us in the way in which it has come. I felt that way about it when it was put into the bill by the other House. I do not say that with any criticism in mind. I know that it is a hard situation with which to deal. I am acutely aware of the difficulties which beset Members of Congress who have no independent income beyond their salaries. I belong to that category. Since I became a Member of the Senate the income taxes have been increased by both the Government and the State from which I come, until last year, out of my salary I paid \$3,000 more in income taxes to the Federal Government and to the State than I had ever before paid at one time. I make no complaint about that because I voted for those taxes, and I voted for them to be withheld from my salary, as I also voted that taxes be withheld from salaries of other people throughout the country.

Mr. President, the number of people in the United States who have the impression that Members of Congress pay no taxes whatever is amazing. Frequently I have become aware of that misinformation in my talks with persons who were surprised when they were told that we pay taxes. How they could have thought that we could have avoided paying taxes, or have the temerity to excuse ourselves from paying taxes, I do not know. But many persons honestly believe that we exempted ourselves from taxation, and especially from the payment of income taxes.

Of course, we know that we are not exempt, and, so far as I am concerned, I shall not vote for any provision which would exempt Members of Congress from paying taxes, whether it be by way of a direct or an indirect increase in a Member's salary. That is one reason why I do not like the provision reported by the committee which was in the appropriation bill now before us. I do not like the indirection by which the objective is sought to be gained. I do not mean by that statement any offense to anyone in any branch of the Govern-



ment. But what the provision in the House bill would do, and what the amendment offered by the committee would do, would be to give Members of Congress an allowance for expenses which we had theretofore been paying out of our own salaries. There can be no doubt about that. That is what either provision would do. It would mean an increase in salary no matter what Senators may call it. If we are going to do that, I would infinitely rather do it directly, and say so in broad open daylight, so that everyone would understand what we were doing.

The parliamentary situation is such, Mr. President, that it embarrasses me, and I feel sure that it embarrasses other Members of the Senate as well. If this proposal is intended as an increase in salary it should have applied to the salaries of Members of both Houses. It should not have been left to one House to increase its salaries, and to the other House to determine whether it, in turn, would also increase its salaries. That has never been done heretofore. I was a Member of the House when the last increase in congressional salaries was made. It was made applicable to the Members of both Houses. It has always been that way during the entire history of the country. There has never been any discrimination between the compensation of Members of the two Houses. From a parliamentary standpoint it is possible that we might find ourselves in such a situation that the Members of one House would receive the increase and the Members of the other House would not receive it. I hope that whatever can be worked out will be applied to both Houses.

Mr. President, I think that the Members of Congress have frequently been unfair to themselves in regard to these matters. I recall a very amusing experience which I had after the increase in salaries from \$7,500 to \$10,000 was granted. I was then a Member of the other House. Approximately 2 weeks before that time I had voted against an increase in the salaries of Government employees. When the salary increase for Members of Congress came before the House I felt that I could not consistently vote to increase my salary after having voted against increasing the salaries of Government employees, and therefore I voted against the proposal. The newspapers in my district carried articles about my having voted against the increase in salaries. They said in effect, "Old BARKLEY stood by the people. He didn't believe in any robbing of the Treasury." Congress adjourned within approximately a week thereafter and I went home. I thought that I would be the hero in my home town. I spent a week going up and down Broadway thinking that everyone whom I met would pat me on the back and say, "Old fellow, you certainly stood by us." I was at home a week before any one even mentioned the matter to me. Finally a farmer who lived 15 miles in the country, who had been a devoted friend of mine for many years, and who always came into town to see me when he heard that I was home from Congress, met me. We backed ourselves up against a brick wall near the street and talked for ap-

proximately an hour about what had been taking place. After talking for about that length of time my farmer friend said, "Well, I see you fellows increased your salaries up there." I said, "Yes, they did it, but I voted against it." He looked at me for about 2 minutes, right in the eye, and finally said, "Well, you are just a damned fool." [Laughter]. That is the only comment I ever heard from that day to this in my district with regard to my having voted against the increase in salaries.

So we are often prone to underestimate the intelligence of the people. We are prone to underestimate their understanding of a situation, and we sometimes magnify our timidity in dealing with our own problems. But when we deal with them I want to deal with them face to face, open and above board, and in broad daylight. I want everybody to know what we are doing. It is for that reason that I do not like the way this proposal has been put into the appropriation bill. I do not much more like the way in which it has been reported by the committee.

I appreciate what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said about increasing the wages of other people and whatever may be done about the matter. I am not sure that I shall vote now for any increase in congressional salaries. My mind is open on that subject. But when I do it I want to know I am doing it so that everybody will understand it, so that there will be no subterfuge about it, no thought that I have gone around through the back yard and come in the kitchen door in order to get into the living room for more salary than I enjoy. That is the way I feel about it. In the attempt to reach a solution I think all those in charge of the proposed legislation should be consulted, and I include those in the House, too, because, from the parliamentary standpoint, as I see it, if the Senate amendment should be rejected and the House language should be retained, there would be nothing in conference, the conferees could not change the provision, because the provision of the bill as it passed the House would be in the bill unchanged, and there would be nothing in the bill with respect to the Senate, so that the question would not be in conference, and the result would be that one House would get the increase and the other would not. I think all of that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I merely wish to make the observation that I think it is rather a harsh criticism of the committee amendment to say that we are trying to come in through a back door. The committee amendment spells out clearly just what we are doing. We are providing an expense account, and we have made a finding that it would amount to about \$2,500. I think in pretty nearly every case it would amount to about \$2,500. Anyone who reads the provision is bound to understand it. There cannot be any misconception about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want my remarks to be regarded as harsh. What has made me feel the way I do about it

is what was done elsewhere. I do not desire to be harsh about that, even, but there is this to be said about it. I do not think any of us can deny that the language of the bill as it passed the House and the language of the Senate committee amendment cover expenses we are now bearing ourselves out of our salaries. There is no question about that. To that extent it is an increase in our net income.

Mr. OVERTON. Expenses which no other employee is bearing, and it is all due to a misinterpretation of the language "away from home."

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree no other employee is bearing it, yet we have been doing it all this time.

Mr. OVERTON. It is due to a misinterpretation of the phrase "away from home."

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it is altogether due to a misinterpretation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, because the disallowance of what we might regard as our expenses on the part of the Internal Revenue Bureau would not be as much as the amount by which we are asked to increase the expense allowance, because if we got all the deductions to which we might think we were entitled, in my judgment, the tax would not amount to as much as the \$2,500 a year.

What gnaws at my conscience is the difference between doing this thing directly, by a straight-out increase in salary, and calling it that, and not exempting it from taxation, and providing an allowance for expenses. It is not subject to taxes, if the expense is a legitimate expense. We do not have to exempt it if it is a legitimate expense. As applied to anyone in the United States, it would be allowed, and there can be no question that there is a discrimination.

Anyone in business or in a profession is entitled to deduct all he spends in order to get business. A lawyer, a doctor, a dentist, or anyone else is entitled to deduct from his income whatever it costs him to get business.

We have always assumed that being a Member of Congress is not business, that there is an element of honor and distinction that goes along with it which is supposed to compensate us for the disadvantages of which we complain, but no one was ever able to pay a grocery bill or house rent with a distinction or with an honorable title, and especially is that true in the District of Columbia. I had a feeling the last time we increased our salaries that our expenses here were increased enough to absorb the increase, and we really had no more net money than we had before.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It helped when we were away.

Mr. BARKLEY. It helped us when we were away. I hope that before we meet Monday, something can be worked out which we can defend, and that it will be made to apply to both Houses alike, because I think it would cheapen either House for the other one to have what in effect is an increase in salary, and have it made inapplicable to the other House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it has been suggested several times this evening that efforts be made to work

out some sort of a compromise on the pending amendment. I think it is incumbent upon me, therefore, to let the Senate know that I intend to make the point of order that the pending committee amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and when the substitute offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] comes before the Senate I shall make the same point of order against the substitute.

I have discovered in the Senate that if I sit around long enough I do not have to make a speech, that others who are far more eloquent and forceful will make my speech for me. Today that has happened; indeed, it has happened twice. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made the speech I should have liked to make, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has just made a statement which fits me to a "t," and exactly expresses my own feeling regarding this whole situation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the integrity of the Congress is at stake in this matter, and I cannot think of anything that is more valuable in this country today than the integrity of Congress. We must maintain that integrity; we must maintain it at all costs in this day of sacrifice. When boys are dying everywhere for the flag, it is not too much to ask us to maintain and support and uphold the integrity of the Congress. That is the thing we must do.

I know it causes sacrifice, of course. The salaries of Senators and the salaries of Representatives have been reduced during the war by extra expenses and by heavy taxes we have laid upon ourselves. Nevertheless, that is a part of the job, that is a part of our duty in this wartime, and we must accept it in the spirit of the present-day situation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, recently I requested the Bureau of Labor Statistics to furnish me a statement relating to the need for higher congressional salaries to meet the rise in living costs. I was furnished with the statement, and in view of the fact that this matter is to go over the week end, I ask that immediately following my remarks the statement be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT RELATING TO THE NEED FOR HIGHER CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES TO MEET THE RISE IN LIVING COSTS

1. FEDERAL SALARIES NOT ADJUSTED TO MEET CHANGING CONDITIONS

The Federal service includes the largest, and indeed, almost the only substantial segment of the Nation's employed population, in which salary and wage scales have not been revised as a result of the changing economic conditions of wartime. Despite the excellent record of the program designed to control potential inflationary forces, especially by comparison with the experience of World War I, the cost of living has increased. The need for higher income taxes and the patriotic duty of making substantial purchases of War bonds have imposed further strains on available funds for all of us. In this situation, the Members of Congress occupy a position which, in many respects, is unique.

2. SHARP DECLINE IN REAL SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Congressional salaries were fixed at \$10,000 per annum in March 1925; there have been no adjustments since that date. Between 1925 and 1939 there was an increase in the real income of the average person employed for wages or on salary. This represented a continuation of long-term trends in the United States, where rising productivity has made possible a gradual rise in living standards. In this period, though congressional salaries were unchanged in amount, the purchasing power increased because prices were somewhat lower in 1939 than in 1925.

Since 1939, with rising wartime prices and higher income taxes there has been a drastic cut in the buying power of congressional salaries. The typical Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, in 1939, paid \$304 in Federal income taxes, assuming that he supported a wife and two children and claimed a 10-percent deduction for contributions and had no other source of income than his congressional salary. The portion of his salary available for expenditures and savings thus amounted to \$9,696 a year. By 1944, his income taxes, computed on the basis of the same assumptions, had risen to \$1,915, leaving \$8,085 of his \$10,000 salary available for expenditures and savings. But \$8,085 will not buy nearly as much now as in 1939. Because prices for everyday necessities have increased by about 30 percent since 1939, the purchasing power of \$8,085 after taxes in 1944 was equal to only \$6,326 in 1939. This is according to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the President's Committee on the Cost of Living. Put another way, a Member of Congress with a family of two children, by 1944, had suffered a decline in effective purchasing and saving power of almost 35 percent so far as his salary income was concerned.

3. INCOMES OF OTHER GROUPS HAVE RISEN

The gross earnings of Federal employees in the classified service increased from an average of about \$1,929 in January 1941 to \$2,448 per year. The bulk of this increase resulted from the lengthening of the scheduled work week from 40 to 48 hours. There has been virtually no change in basic salary scales since 1930. After allowance for higher taxes and the rise in the cost of living of about 30 percent from January 1941, the purchasing power of their earnings (after allowance for the tax paid by a worker supporting a wife and two children) was almost 5 percent lower in December 1944 than in January 1941. The pay of Members of Congress, of course, cannot possibly be based on the length of the work week, and there has, therefore, been no such basis for offsetting rising living costs, even though there has been an immeasurable increase in the wartime workload of the Congress.

In private industry there are no comprehensive reports on salaried workers in the higher-income brackets. Most of the information available is on wage earners who, however, form the bulk of the working population and whose earnings are of the utmost importance in the general economic situation of the country. Increases in basic wage rates have been granted quite generally in private industry, and the total of these raises approximates the 15 percent set forth in the Little Steel formula of the War Labor Board. For total earnings, as opposed to wage rates, the increase is much greater. In manufacturing, for example, weekly gross earnings of wage earners have risen by 78 percent as a result of the lengthened work week and increased premiums for overtime and night work, as well as the revisions made in basic rates. Their income from wages, after allowance for higher taxes, for increases in Social Security deductions, and for the rise in living costs, are consequently nearly

36 percent higher than in January 1941, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This is in contrast to the decrease of about 35 percent in salary income available for expenditures and savings experienced by Members of Congress.

4. MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SUBJECT TO HEAVY SPECIAL EXPENSES

There are, however, certain differences which must be taken into account. The effect of price increases since January 1941 on the proportions of income available for expenditure and savings has been measured in terms of the Government's official cost of living index as compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics plus allowances made by the President's Committee on the Cost of Living.<sup>1</sup> This index is designed to trace the price changes of the more or less standard or average bill of commodities and services purchased by the typical family of moderate means—those whose 1934-36 incomes averaged about \$1,500. It is obvious that the essentials of living such as food, clothing, rent, and the like constitute a larger share of the total expenditures or living costs of such families than they do in the case of those with incomes of \$10,000. Thus the increase, since 1939, of some 45 percent in the average cost of food is more important to the moderate income groups than it is to those with higher salaries.

It is undoubtedly true, therefore, that the effect of the 30-percent increase in the cost of living index since January 1941 is less serious in the case of the average Member of Congress than it is among the lower-income groups.

There are, however, offsetting factors that are of considerable importance. Members of Congress find it necessary either to incur the expense of moving their households or to maintain their families at home and depend on hotels for their own accommodations. In both cases, the increases in costs are considerable.

If their households are moved to Washington, they must compete for very scarce housing, and, moreover, pay rents which are in general, higher than those in the cities from which they came. The 1940 census indicates that residential rentals in the Washington area were exceeded by only 8 of the Nation's 204 cities of 50,000 or more population. Only one of the 55 cities of 100,000 or more had higher rents than Washington. The problem of finding adequate quarters is emphasized by the fact that, since 1943, at least 13 percent of the single-family dwellings formerly rented in Washington and its suburbs have been removed from the rental market and been occupied by owners. The lack of housing frequently makes it necessary for Members of Congress and their families to live in hotels and eat in restaurants, and that is always an expensive way to live.

While no precise measurement of such factors is possible, it is undeniable that the costs of entertaining and similar items have increased markedly. In the typical family budget, such expenditures are ordinarily classified as luxuries. In the case of Members of Congress, they are essential standards that must, for obvious reasons, be maintained.

This fact has a further important implication. The budget of the typical family with a \$10,000 income usually includes a substantial item for savings—about \$2,500 in 1941. Unanticipated outlays, such as those that result from increased prices, can, there-

<sup>1</sup> The actual increase according to the official index amounted to 25.8 percent. The remainder is an adjustment, arrived at by the President's Committee on the Cost of Living as an allowance for quality deterioration and other conditions inherent in the present seller's market that do not lend themselves to precise statistical measurement.



fore, often be met only by a cut in savings. The special situation of Members of Congress with respect to extra expenses means that the amounts available for savings have probably always been somewhat smaller than those of the typical family in the same income class. There was, consequently, much less leeway in the Congressman's pre-war budget for adjustment to wartime changes in prices and in income taxes.

#### 5. EFFECT OF SALARY REVISIONS

If full allowance were made for higher retail prices since 1941, salaries would have to be at least \$13,000. But wage and salary revisions made in recognition of increased living costs have been limited by the War Labor Board to an average of 15 percent under the wage stabilization program. An increase of 15 percent in Congressional salaries would raise the total salary to \$11,500; and the average income after taxes to \$9,125 in 1944 dollars and to \$7,146 in 1939 dollars, that is, if allowance is made for increased living costs.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am very much opposed to the pending amendment, but I do not desire to delay the Senate with any further remarks, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Record a statement prepared by me giving my reasons for my opposition to the amendment. I make this request because of the fact that I am leaving town tomorrow on official business, and may not be here when the amendment is brought up for disposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The action of the House and of the Senate Appropriations Committee in making a flat allowance of \$2,500 for expenses of the Members of the House and Senate, which will be exempt from taxation, is, in my judgment, very ill-advised. I know of no similar instance wherein a lump sum is given to any Government official for expenses.

What this in reality means is that the salaries of Senators will be increased by \$2,500, and this increase will be exempt from taxation.

A Representative or Senator who is married, without other dependents, now pays \$2,400 in taxes on a \$10,000 salary. If his salary were increased to \$12,500, he would pay \$3,365. Therefore, by this method of giving a lump sum for expenses, the amount of \$965 is saved to the individual Senator in taxation. This means that instead of the increase in salary being 25 percent, it is actually 35 percent net, taking into consideration the tax exemption on the \$2,500 increase.

Since 1941, all wages have been controlled on a basis of 15 percent increase as applied to January 1941. Representatives and Senators are, of course, entitled to this increase, but, if an increase is made to the Members of Congress in excess of the Little Steel formula, in my judgment, it will inevitably follow that the War Labor Board will be forced to abandon this formula and to make increases throughout the country on a basis of the increase given to Representatives and Senators.

The next few months ahead of us may determine whether we will go from the disasters of war to the disasters of inflation. There could be no more inappropriate time for the Members of Congress to put themselves in a special class and receive special benefits than at this time. For the first time in the history of our country, the Government itself has been attempting to control

wage increases for the purpose of preventing inflation. What Congress does for its own membership will be taken as a criterion and a basis for increases to be made by the various Government boards that have charge of such matters.

In the form in which this increase is submitted to the Senate it presents two vital questions. The first is: Should the salaries of the Representatives and Senators be increased 25 percent? The second is: Should that increase be exempt from taxation?

So far as my knowledge goes, there is not a single Government official who is not compelled to furnish an accounting and exact statements of all expenses incurred before he can be reimbursed out of the Federal Treasury. But, in this case, a lump sum is given, and there is no requirement to furnish an itemized account.

This is not only the wrong time to make an increase as large as this, but it is being done in the wrong way. Neither should this increase be made retroactive back to January 1, as this will establish a precedent for all other wage increases to be retroactive also.

I am perfectly willing, and, in fact, anxious, to see the salaries of the Representatives and Senators increased in proportion to the increases made to all other Government workers which was 15 percent, and in accordance with the wage control policies of the War Labor Board, but let us recognize that when we go beyond this we are inviting a situation which may mean disaster to the country. The amount concerned may not be so great, but the policy may be very far-reaching in its effects.

The Congress of the United States is growing in public esteem. Every day that I remain in the Senate I am more and more impressed with the diligence, hard work, and capacity of the individual Senator, but it is just such a thing as this that will bring discredit upon the Congress. I think it would be far better to defer any increase in salaries until the termination of wage controls, unless such increase is given in accordance with the wage formula of 15 percent increase.

DAVID B. SMITH

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 209) for the relief of David B. Smith, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$3,267.10" insert the figures "\$2,667.10," and agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
W. LEE O'DANIEL,  
WAYNE MORSE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. McGEHEE,  
EUGENE J. KEOGH,  
JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this a bill which came originally from the Committee on Claims?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

KATHERINE SMITH

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

1567) for the relief of Katherine Smith, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$4,772" insert the figures "\$4,272," and agree to the same.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
JAMES M. TUNNELL,  
GEORGE A. WILSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. McGEHEE,  
EUGENE J. KEOGH,  
JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

#### PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE MAKING OF TREATIES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 1st of May the senate of the State of Florida and on the 2d of May the house of representatives of the State of Florida adopted a resolution which I believe will have historic significance. It was an application to the Congress under article v of the Constitution. It is very brief and reads as follows:

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

SECTION 1. That in accordance with article 5 of the Constitution of the United States of America the legislature of the State of Florida does hereby make application to the Congress of the United States to call a Constitutional Convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by adding thereto an article providing substantially as follows:

#### "ARTICLE —

"Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of both Houses of the Congress."

SEC. 2. That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Florida to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. President, I issued a public release in comment upon the adoption of the resolution by the Florida Legislature, which I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Legislature of Florida, upon my recommendation, has just done something historic; something to help prevent War III.

By a resolution passed last week the legislature made Florida the first State in the Union to set in motion the machinery to change the Constitution of the United States so that treaties may be made by agreement of both Houses of Congress rather than by two-thirds of the Senate.

At present the House of Representatives, the body in the Congress closest to the people, is necessary to a declaration of war. But it has no part in making a treaty of peace or in our joining an international organization to keep the peace. Only the Senate has anything to say about that.

But even the Senate cannot agree to a treaty or to any organization like the United Nations unless two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present when such a matter is considered agree to such proposal. That provision defeated the League of Nations and contributed to the present awful war. For there is no doubt that a majority of the

Senate and the House of Representatives would have agreed to the League of Nations as recommended by President Wilson if they had had the power to do so.

This two-thirds rule gives as few as 17 Senators the power to defeat a treaty. Thirty-three Senators could do it at any time.

That means that after the United Nations organization is set up at San Francisco by representatives of all the United Nations a third plus one of the Senate can keep us out of that organization. A third plus one of the Senate could keep us out in spite of the people overwhelmingly favoring our getting in and helping to keep world peace. This third, plus one, of the Senate could keep us out of the United Nations in spite of as many as 63 of the Members of the Senate favoring our taking an honorable part in that effort to prevent war.

The time has come, therefore, to modernize our peace-making and peace-keeping machinery.

Both Houses of Congress represent the people; both Houses declare war; both Houses have to pass legislation which is usually necessary to carry out any treaty we make; both Houses have to make any appropriations necessary to carry out any treaty. Both Houses, therefore, should speak for the people in making agreements with other nations, not just two-thirds of the Senate, whose Members are not answerable to the people except every 6 years.

And both Houses of Congress should act in making treaties as they act in declaring war or in passing all legislation, by a majority vote in each House. That is democracy. Then no other little group of willful men can throw away another peace as they did after the last war.

The Florida resolution is in the exact language of the resolution passed by the House in Washington, of which Chairman HARRY SUMNERS, of Texas, of the House Judiciary Committee is author.

It provides:

"Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of both Houses of the Congress."

The House resolution of Mr. SUMNERS cannot be submitted to the States by the Congress without the concurrence of the Senate by a two-thirds vote, and I doubt if the Senate will, of its own accord, give up its exclusive power to ratify treaties.

Hence the only way we can hope to strike down the two-thirds rule of the Senate is for 32 States to ask Congress to call a convention for proposing this amendment to permit both Houses of the Congress to ratify treaties.

Florida has shown the way and now if 31 other States will follow her lead we can enable our Government to keep faith with our honored dead and to help to save the peace for which he gave "the last full measure of devotion."

All honor to the vision of the Florida Legislature. The Nation will expect other legislatures, most of which are meeting this year, to follow Florida.

#### INTERNATIONAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 281, Senate Resolution 122, relative to participation by the Government of the United States in the organization by the nations of the world of an International Office of Education.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. TAFT) on April 30, 1945, and which had been re-

ported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the words "world of", to strike out "an International Office of Education" and insert "a permanent international organization for educational and cultural affairs"; and on page 2, after the word "cultural", to strike out "relation, the exchange of students and scholars" and insert "relations", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States urges the participation by the Government of the United States in the organization by the nations of the world of a permanent international organization for educational and cultural affairs, for the purpose of advising together and considering problems of international educational and cultural relations throughout the world, and more particularly for the purpose of organizing a permanent international agency to promote educational and cultural relations and the encouragement within each country of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups; provided that such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations, or their administration.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask if this is the resolution concerning which the Senator from Arkansas spoke to me earlier in the day, in which he and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are interested?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution relative to participation by the Government of the United States in the organization by the nations of the world of a permanent international organization for educational and cultural affairs."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the resolution a number of letters addressed to me which are representative of others I have received. One is from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. One from the Educational Policies Commission, one from the American Federation of Labor, one from the American Association for the United Nations, Inc., and one from the American Council on Education.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE  
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA,  
New York, N. Y., May 18, 1945.

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have the honor to communicate to you the following resolution, unanimously adopted by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America on May 15, 1945:

"Believing that the development of a world order of peace and justice requires continuous educational efforts among all peoples, the Executive Committee of the Federal

Council of the Churches of Christ in America urges the Government of the United States to take an active part in the organization and support of an International Office of Education by the nations of the world for the purpose of promoting educational and cultural interests."

I am confident that there is a widespread and growing interest throughout the 26 national denominations which comprise the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in the movement for establishing an International Office of Education and that prompt action by the Congress of the United States along this line would be heartily welcomed.

With high regard, I remain

Very sincerely yours,

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT,  
General Secretary.

THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1945.  
The Honorable JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I am authorized to put the National Education Association on record as enthusiastically endorsing Senate Resolution 122. For years our association has been committed to this idea, and we sincerely hope that the Senate will pass your resolution. Doing so at this time will have a profound influence on the delegates assembled at San Francisco. We feel that education must have a place in the organization designed to provide for international security, for the peace of the world depends upon mutual understanding and cooperation among peoples.

The National Education Association wishes to congratulate you on your vision and wishes you success in the passing of this resolution.

Cordially yours,

RALPH F. STREBEL,  
Assistant Secretary.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1945.  
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
United States Senate Office,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The American Federation of Labor is on record as approving an International Office of Education. At our last convention held in New Orleans last November, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor reported to the convention on this subject as follows:

"We submit that the reconstruction of the cultural life of nations now at war is certainly as important as their economic reconstruction."

"Above all the principle of cultural autonomy for all nations must be adhered to in every phase of reconstruction. We believe that every possible form of material help must be given the victimized nations in rebuilding their cultural life."

"We believe that in helping the nations which have been laid in ruin by the Axis Powers to reconstruct themselves, we must recognize the right of these people to govern themselves; that while we offer material help to enable these victimized nations to rebuild themselves, the giving of such material help, no matter how vast the amount, must in no instance deny these people complete political and cultural autonomy. On the other hand, we recognize that the treatment afforded the Axis nations must be neither sentimentally indulgent nor dominated by any vengeance. We would treat the people in the Axis nations humanely and seek to afford them the opportunities through which they may regain a sense of moral and social values. We hold, however, that the Axis nations must prove by their deeds that they are worthy of sharing in the common life of the peace-loving world."



"We would particularly urge that every possible aid be given to enable the victimized nations to rebuild their cultural life as quickly as possible, with only such direction from other nations as any nation may ask for from the UNRRA, or from any nation."

"The Boston convention in 1943 endorsed the principle of an International Office of Education. \* \* \*

"Reaffirming convention action of last year, and amplifying it further, we recommend that in the new world institutions there be established an International Office of Education, coordinated with the general international political organization, but free from domination by it, which office shall serve as a medium for exchange of teachers, students, and as a center of investigation and research in any and all fields of education. If and when any nation or people solicits the advice or help of the International Office of Education such advice and help shall be given. The office should also undertake such cooperative projects which are mutually deemed desirable."

"We hold that in this new world educational organization there should be a definite recognition of the role of the free teacher organization."

I sincerely hope the Congress of the United States will approve participation in an International Office of Education organized along the above lines.

Very truly yours,

WM. F. GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

#### AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE

UNITED NATIONS, INC.,

New York, N. Y., May 8, 1945.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have the honor to send you the following resolution adopted at a meeting of the Education Committee of the American Association for the United Nations:

"The Education Committee of the American Association for the United Nations expresses its hearty approval of participation by the Government of the United States in an International Office of Education to be set up as an autonomous agency of the United Nations Organization. The functions of such an office should be to promote educational and cultural relations among the nations of the world, in particular the exchange of students and scholars, and the encouragement of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups."

"Even in normal times such an agency could be of the greatest usefulness in promoting those relations among nations upon which peace depends. In the postwar world, with educational institutions in many countries destroyed, intellectual leaders murdered and millions of youth deprived of normal educational opportunities, such an office becomes of first-rank importance. Cooperation among educational leaders of all the United Nations can assure that positive approach to peace which will be necessary, if peoples of all nations are to understand each other and if youth are to be trained in their responsibilities as citizens of the United Nations."

"It is our considered opinion that adequate provision should be made in the United Nations Charter now being formulated at San Francisco for an International Office of Education which can discharge the above functions."

Members of the committee endorsing the resolution are as follows: Mrs. Dana Converse Backus, chairman; Dr. Harry J. Carman, Dean, Columbia University; Mrs. Harvey N. Davis, Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, director, Institute of International Education; William

A. Hamm, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, New York City; Dr. Erling Hunt, Teachers College, Columbia University; Dr. Quincy Wright, University of Chicago; Mrs. Harrison Thomas, Secretary to the Committee.

We trust the adoption of this resolution will be of interest to you in connection with the bill which you have recently introduced in the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

MRS. HARRISON THOMAS.

#### AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,

Washington, D. C., May 18, 1945.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I am sending you herewith a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Council on Education, signed by Mr. Julius E. Warren, Commissioner of Education for the State of Massachusetts and acting chairman of the council. Copies of this resolution were sent to each member of the American delegation to the San Francisco Conference.

The resolution calls for the formation of an international education and cultural relations agency within the structure of the world security organization. It is my understanding that a copy of this resolution will be included in a report which you will make to the Senate on Senate Resolution 122.

I am also attaching a tabulation of replies from the constituent members of the American Council on Education to a question which was recently submitted to them individually regarding the setting up of an international office of education and cultural relations.

The membership of the American Council on Education includes nearly 700 leading colleges, universities, and school systems, public and private, and approximately 110 national organizations in the field of education and in allied fields. For your information I am enclosing a list of our membership as of November 1, 1944.

In the absence of Dr. George F. Zook, president of the council, who is now at San Francisco serving as a consultant to the American delegation, I shall be glad to confer with you if it seems necessary to clarify any of the points in the enclosed resolution.

In closing, let me say that the action of the executive committee of the American Council on Education leads me to believe that it strongly endorses the reporting and passage of Senate Resolution 122.

Yours very truly,

A. J. BRUMBAUGH,

Vice President.

MAY 4, 1945.

In accordance with opinions expressed in ballots from representatives of 59 constituent organizations belonging to the American Council on Education, the executive committee of the council, meeting in Washington May 4, 1945, strongly urges the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference to support specific provision for an international office of education and cultural relations as an integral part of an international organization. Provision for this office will give due recognition both to the importance of cultural interchange in the maintenance of world peace and to the role of education in promoting this interchange. It will, moreover, avoid the great confusion which for 20 years prior to the outbreak of the present war has resulted from the division between two international organizations of responsibilities for the closely related fields of education and intellectual cooperation.

JULIUS E. WARREN,

Acting Chairman, American  
Council on Education.

MAY 18, 1945.

The American Council on Education recently submitted to the representatives of the 59 constituent organizations which make up the council the following question:

"Do you personally favor or oppose the setting up of an international office of education and cultural relations?"

Although only a short time has elapsed, favorable replies have already been received from the delegates of the following organizations:

American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (B. V. Christensen and Wortley F. Rudd).

American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (R. P. Brooks).

American Association of Physics Teachers (K. Lark-Horovitz and Richard M. Sutton).  
American Association of Teachers Colleges (Frank E. Baker).

American Association of University Women (Kathryn McHale).

American Education Fellowship (Frank E. Baker).

American Film Center (J. C. Wardlaw).

American Library Association (Carl H. Milam).

Association of American Colleges (Goodrich C. White and Guy E. Snavely).

Association of American Law Schools (Ernest Fraser and F. G. D. Ribble).

Association of American Medical Colleges (W. T. Sanger).

Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing (Marion G. Howell, Isabel M. Stewart, and Sister M. Olivia Gowan).

Board of Education of the Methodist Church (John O. Gross).

Boy Scouts of America (E. Urner Goodman and Ray O. Wyland).

Council on Dental Education (William N. Hodgkin, Harlan H. Horner, and John T. O'Rourke).

Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, American Medical Association (Victor Johnson).

Educational Records Bureau (Eugene R. Smith, Arthur E. Traxler, and Ben D. Wood).

Institute of International Education (Stephen Duggan).

International Council on Religious Education (Roy G. Ross).

Jesuit Educational Association (Edward B. Rooney, S. J.).

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Karl G. Miller).

National Association of Colleges and Departments of Education (M. R. Trabue).

National Association of Secondary-School Principals (Paul E. Elieker).

National Association of Schools of Music (D. M. Swarthout).

National Association of Teachers of Speech (W. Hayes Yeager and Joseph F. Smith).

National Collegiate Athletic Association (K. L. Wilson).

National Council of Independent Schools (Edward B. Rooney, S. J.).

National Council for the Social Studies (Merrill F. Hartshorn).

National Council of Teachers of English (Harold A. Anderson).

National Education Association (Joseph H. Saunders).

National League of Nursing Education (Adelaide A. Mayo).

National University Extension Association (George B. Zehmer).

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (G. D. Humphrey, G. W. Rosenlof, and John Dale Russell).

Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education (Donald B. Prentice).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared relating to Senate Resolution 122 may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The resolution before the Senate proposes that we urge upon the President the participation by the Government of the United States in the formation of a permanent international organization for educational and cultural affairs to promote educational and cultural relations and the encouragement within each country of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups.

It is perhaps important to point out what the organization is not. The resolution expressly provides that the proposed agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations or with their administration. The character of education given in each country is entirely the affair of that country. Nor has it anything to do with the education of Germany. If any deliberate program is undertaken in Germany to try to eliminate the Nazi philosophy, it is a matter for the forces of occupation and the governments of the occupying powers and not of the proposed international organization.

This organization is more on the order of the International Labor Office established under the League of Nations. Its purposes are to stimulate throughout the world an interest in education and bring home to all the importance of education, both in raising the standard of living and maintaining a world peace. It is to be a forum in which representatives of the different nations may meet, discuss systems of education, and develop ideas for its promotion. In the past there has been such cooperation among those interested in politics, in business, in finance, and in labor, but there has been no such meeting place for those concerned with education.

We are proposing an economic council of the nations, and proposing to concern ourselves with creating a world prosperity. I venture to suggest that no single element can increase the standard of living of a people as much as universal education. It teaches the people the standards of the rest of the world to which they can aspire. Many nations cannot hope for economic prosperity if they go on increasing the population as they have in recent years. I do not think there is any solution to this problem except much wider education in these countries. Furthermore, an education which includes complete knowledge of other peoples and their viewpoint is almost the only hope of peace, and any educational system which is not based on freedom of communications is hardly worth the name of education.

In the immediate future, the proposed organization can give advice and encouragement to the various nations in reconstructing their systems of education destroyed by the war. It can propose methods for the rebuilding and reestablishment of colleges and universities. It can assist in building up a new teacher force. It can arrange for the exchange of standards between different nations in order to remove misunderstandings and causes of war. It can fix standards of education so that nations can judge the quality of the education they are giving.

It may be desirable to set up this organization in connection with the Economic and Social Council provided by the San Francisco agreement, but I believe it could also stand on its own feet if it seems to our Government more desirable to handle it in that way. In any event, and in any form, I believe it will contribute to the cause of peace and prosperity throughout the world.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### NOMINATION OF JUDGE LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the messages from the President submitting sundry nominations, which have just been laid before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement issued by President William Green of the American Federation of Labor relative to the appointment by President Truman of Judge Lewis B. Schwellenbach to be Secretary of Labor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 23, 1945.

President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, today issued the following comment on the appointment by President Truman of Lewis B. Schwellenbach as Secretary of Labor:

"We regard Judge Schwellenbach as a most capable and well-qualified man to serve. He showed that he possessed a very clear understanding of labor and labor's problems when he served in the United States Senate. His record there was excellent from a labor point of view. We look forward to his service as Secretary of Labor with a feeling of confidence and satisfaction and will gladly cooperate with him as fully and completely as possible.

"In addition to that, we are going to urge that he take steps to consolidate within the Labor Department all the agencies of the Government that deal with labor problems and labor questions and in that way to expand the service of the Labor Department.

"We hope that he may set up an advisory committee so that we may serve with him and cooperate with him in his work as Secretary of Labor."

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Ronald M. Holmes for appointment as an administrative officer, national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Adm. Harold B. Sallada to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years; and

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of June 1945, in lieu of appointments as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Lee A. Klrstein; and  
William C. Stack

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Kentucky that he except from his request the three nominations of postmasters in New York. One of the Senators from that State asked that the New York nominations of postmasters go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. With the exceptions just referred to, I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters in Arkansas, Ohio, and Oklahoma are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 28, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1945:

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Tom C. Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General, vice Francis Biddle, resigned.

##### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of Agriculture, vice Claude R. Wickard, nominated to be Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration.

##### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington, to be Secretary of Labor, vice Frances Perkins, resigned.



## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Claude R. Wickard, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

## SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Austin S. Imirie for appointment as an administrative officer, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Compensation for the position of administrative officer, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of \$6,500 per annum.

## PUERTO RICO

Rafael Pico, of Puerto Rico, to be commissioner of education for Puerto Rico, vice José M. Gallardo.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

Walter J. Chovan to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 1st day of May 1945.

V. Ralph Sobieralski to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 26th day of March 1945.

Robert H. Randall to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 26th day of March 1945.

Lorin F. Woodcock to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 3d day of February 1945.

A. Gordon Anderson to be aide, with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 1st day of May 1945.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be lieutenant colonels with rank from June 13, 1945*

Maj. Charles Joseph Barrett, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, Field Artillery (temporary major general).

Maj. Henry James Woodbury, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Edmund Clayton Lynch, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Francis Jennings Wilson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Alfred August Kessler, Jr., Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Paschal Neilson Strong, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Lawrence Coy Leonard, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Mervin Eugene Gross, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Robert Wayne Raynsford, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. LeRoy Judson Stewart, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. John Francis Uncles, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Giles Richard Carpenter, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. David James Crawford, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Field Sadtler, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Earl Foster Thomson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Charles Newsom Branham, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Francis Borgia Kane, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. William Stevens Lawton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Albert Svihra, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Granger Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Alfred Eugene Kastner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Edwin Paul Crandell, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Mark McClure, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw, Air Corps (temporary major general).

Maj. Myron Leedy, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Alba Carlton Spalding, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Robert Landon Taylor, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Stephen Cecil Lombard, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Fred James Woods, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Kenneth Francis Pughe, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Robert Smith McClenaghan, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Charles Hancock Reed, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walter Russell Hensey, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Orval Ray Cook, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Perry McCoy Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. James Wrathall Spry, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Gordon Sherman Armes, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Frederick William Hein, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Charles Rufus Smith, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Harold Alfred Meyer, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Robert Earle Blair, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. James Dunne O'Connell, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Numa Augustin Watson, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Wesley Woodworth Yale, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Robert Wilkins Douglass, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major general).

Maj. Oliver Wendell Hughes, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Melville Fuller Grant, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. James Robinson Pierce, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Lemuel Mathewson, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Thomas Varon Webb, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. George Arthur Taylor, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Alfred Lawrence Price, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

*To be lieutenant colonels with rank from June 14, 1945*

Maj. Frank Llewellyn Beadle, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Gilbert Hayden, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Thomas Herbert Maddocks, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. David Marion Fowler, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Edward Arthur Kleinman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. John Lawson Ballantyne, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Hilbert Milton Wittkop, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Donald Quitman Harris, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. John Percy Kennedy, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Andrew Wedemeyer, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Edwin Carlo Greiner, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Oliver Perry Newman, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Ronald Gorrie MacDonald, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. John Hughes Stodter, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Thomas Edward Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Stewart Tiffany Vincent, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Paul Henry Mahoney, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. James Clyde Fry, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Austin Folger Gilmartin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

*To be lieutenant colonel with rank from June 26, 1945*

Maj. James Harrison Dickie, Finance Department (temporary colonel).

*To be major with rank from June 6, 1945*

Capt. Elmer Perry Rose, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

*To be majors with rank from June 7, 1945*

Capt. Ford J. Lauer, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Fay Oliver Dice, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Herbert Everett Rice, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Edward Harold Porter, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. Robert Leonard Schoenlein, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Frederick William Ott, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Wentworth Goss, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. James Leslie Daniel, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Budd John Peaslee, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. John Franklin Egan, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. Donald Dewey Arnold, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Clarence Thomas Mower, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Louie Percy Turner, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

*To be majors with rank from June 9, 1945*

Capt. James Laffeter Green, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Capt. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Capt. Theodore Scott Riggs, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Capt. Frederick Jensen Dau, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Capt. William Tell Hefley, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Roland Clough Brown, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Capt. Samuel Roberts Browning, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Capt. Lyle Edward Seeman, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. William Dixon Smith, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Thomas Fraley Van Natta 3d, Cavalry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Robert Scott Israel, Jr., Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. David Andrew Watt, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Donald Bertrand Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Rudolph Ethelbert Smyser, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Francis Howard Falkner, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Alan Johnstone McCutchen, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. David William Helman, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Robert John Fleming, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Benjamin Smith Shute, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. William Everett Potter, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Edmund Koehler Daley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Webster Anderson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James Elbert Briggs, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. John Stewart Mills, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. George Morris Cole, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Duncan Sloan Somerville, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. David William Traub, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Thomas Jennings Wells, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. George Warren Mundy, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Alfred Rockwood Maxwell, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Paul Harold Johnston, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. William Ross Currie, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Peter Duryea Calyer, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Walter Godley Donald, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Roscoe Charles Wilson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Walter Edwin Todd, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. William Henry Hennig, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Bryant LeMalre Boatner, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Robert Frederick Tate, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Richard Jerome Handy, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Samuel Robert Brentnall, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. John Blanchard Grinstead, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. John Paul Breden, Cavalry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Harvey Weston Wilkinson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Walter Edgerton Johns, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Charles Franklin Born, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Daniel McCoy Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Frank Fort Everest, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Frank Quincy Goodell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Garrison Barkley Coverdale, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Leslie Haynes Wyman, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. John Jordan Morrow, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Mercer Christie Walter, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Theodore John Dayharsh, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Frank Jerdone Coleman, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Robert Loyal Easton, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Elmer Briant Thayer, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James Stewart Neary, Ordnance Department (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Norris Brown Harbold, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. John Cogswell Oakes, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Leslie George Ross, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. George Raymond Bienfang, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Roger Woodhull Goldsmith, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Russell Alger Wilson, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Charles Grant Goodrich, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Elmo Stewart Mathews, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Paul Amos Gavan, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Alvord Van Patten Anderson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Frederick Lewis Anderson, Air Corps (temporary major general).  
 Capt. Marion George Pohl, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. John Archibald Sawyer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. John Southworth Upham, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Thayer Stevens Olds, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Samuel Leslie Myers, Cavalry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Robert Albert Howard, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Thomas Joseph Counihan, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Ephraim Hester McLemore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James Easton Holley, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Frederick G. Stritzinger 4th, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Robert Falligant Travis, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. John Dabney Billingsley, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Thomas Joseph Cody, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Robert George Butler, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Carl Herman Sturges, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Joseph Anthony Michela, Cavalry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. William Henry Tunner, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Robert Tryon Frederick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major general).  
 Capt. Ralph Edward Koon, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Howard Graham Bunker, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Edward Cassel Reber, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Allison Richard Hartman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. John Alexander Samford, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Douglas Glen Ludlam, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Legare Kilgore Tarrant, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Harry Warren Halterman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. William Mattingly Breckinridge, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. James Lowman Hathaway, Cavalry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Fred Obediah Tally, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Walter Emerson Finnegan, Cavalry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Russell Blair, Infantry (temporary major).  
 Capt. Charles Ralph Pinkerton, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Edwin Augustus Cummings, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Lionel Charles McGarr, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James Melvin Lamont, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Montgomery Breck Raymond, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Noble James Wiley, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Wilhelm Paul Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Roger Maxwell Ramey, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Carl Ferdinand Fritzsche, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. John Peter Doidge, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Forrest Gordon Allen, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Ralph Joseph Butchers, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Samuel Egbert Anderson, Air Corps (temporary major general).  
 Capt. Everett Davenport Peddicord, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James Gallagher Bain, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. August William Schermacher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Robert Franklin Tomlin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Louis Test Vickers, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Joseph Arthur Bulger, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Kilbourne Johnston, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Ralph Harold Sievers, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. John Raymond Gilchrist, Finance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Frank Rudolph Maerdian, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. George Ferrow Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Allen Wilson Reed, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Arthur William Meehan, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Frank Leonard Bock, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Thomas Joseph Moran, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. James Elmer Totten, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Truman Hempel Landon, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Charles Frank Howard, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Hampden Eugene Montgomery, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Elmer Wentworth Gude, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Harry Edgar Wilson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).



Capt. Robert Williams Warren, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. John Francis Wadman, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Delmar Taft Spivey, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Maury Spotswood Crallé, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Ramon Antonio Nadal, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Carroll Huston Prunty, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. August Walter Kissner, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Edgar Elliott Enger, Finance Department (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. LeVerne George Saunders, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Tito George Moscatelli, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Louis Russell Delmonico, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. George Henry Lawrence, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. George Clinton Willette, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Francis Henry Boos, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Gauden McIntosh Watkins, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Thomas Lilley Sherburne, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Stanhope Brasfield Mason, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Eugene Thomas Lewis, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Allen Thayer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Richard Wetherill, Infantry (temporary major).  
 Capt. Donald Winston Titus, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Emmett Felix Yost, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James William Lockett, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Paul DeWitt Adams, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).  
 Capt. Evan McLaren Houseman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Ralph Thomas Nelson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Robert Kinder Taylor, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James Morrow Ivy, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. William Grant Caldwell, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. William Thomas Moore, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Paul Jones Mitchell, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Alfred Benjamin Denniston, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. James Wilson Brown, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. William Columbus Sams, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Joseph Franklin Trent, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Capt. Andrew Thomas McNamara, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Thomas Mason Tarpley, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. James Francis Olive, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Edgar Alexander Sirmeyer, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 Capt. Thomas Webster Steed, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 Capt. Paul Elliott MacLaughlin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
*To be captains with rank from June 12, 1945*  
 First Lt. John Drake Bristol, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Donald Abeel Phelan, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Aaron Evan Harris, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. David Hamilton Gregg, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Albert Joseph Shower, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. David Campbell Wallace, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Arthur Houston Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Herbert Caran Gee, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Jack Wallis Hickman, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Donald Allen Elliget, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Clyde Calhoun Zeigler, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Leighton Ira Davis, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Charles Bernard Rynearson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Oliver Joseph Pickard, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Otto Jacob Rohde, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. John Somers Buist Dick, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. William Winston Lapsley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. James De Vore Lang, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Charles Jephthiah Jeffus, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Henry Lewis Hille, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. John Lathrop Throckmorton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. George Ruhlen, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Cornelis DeWitt Willcox Lang, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. John Richards Parker, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Clarence Carl Haug, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. John Sutton Growdon, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. John Joseph Duffy, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Warren Sylvester Everett, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Carl Watkins Miller, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Salvatore Andrew Armogida, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. William Paulding Grieves, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Stanley Tage Birger Johnson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. James Van Gorder Wilson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Frank Alexander Osmanski, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Bernard Sanders Waterman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Frederick Benjamin Hall, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Langfitt Bowditch Wilby, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. John Dudley Cole, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

First Lt. George Raymond Wilkins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Harry James Lewis, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Charles Albert Symroski, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Henry Chaffee Thayer, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. James Yeates Adams, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Duncan Sinclair, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. John Kimball Brown, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Geoffrey Dixon Ellerson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Robert Morris Stillman, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Ray Allen Pillivant, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Ellery Willis Niles, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Robert Rigby Glass, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. George Stafford Eckhardt, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Alvin Dolliver Robbins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Sidney George Spring, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Edward Stephen Bechtold, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Ivan Clare Rumsey, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Daniel John Murphy, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Clarence Bidgood, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Walter Albert Simpson, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Edward Gray, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Hugh McClellan Exton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Sanford Welsh Horstman, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Kelso Gordon Clow, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Harry Herndon Critz, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Henry Porter van Ormer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Edward Kraus, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Kenneth Irwin Curtis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Joseph Charles Moore, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Earl Leo Barr, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. John Alexis Gloriod, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Nathaniel Macon Martin, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Joseph Gordon Russell, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Salathiel Fred Cummings, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. James Martin Worthington, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

- First Lt. James Michael Donohue, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Robert Clarence McDonald, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Joseph Waters Keating, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Halford Robert Greenlee, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Richard Marvin Bauer, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Lawrence Robert St. John, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Gerald Frederick Brown, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Willard George Root, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Robert Van Roo, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Arthur Allison Fickel, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Charles Naclean Peeke, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Horace Wilson Hinkle, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Raymond Boyd Firehock, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Downs Eugene Ingram, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Milton Lawrence Rosen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Edgar Allan Clarke, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. James Mobley Kimbrough, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Ralph Wright, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Harrison Barnwell Harden, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
- First Lt. Edward Moseley Harris, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. James Luke Frink, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Elmer John Gibson, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Julius Desmond Stanton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. James Howard Walsh, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Walter Joseph Bryde, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Thomas Washington Woodyard, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Stuart Gilbert Fries, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Harry Rich Hale, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. James Frank Skells, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Willis Fred Chapman, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Seneca Wilbur Foote, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. James Willoughby Totten, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. William Henderson Baynes, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Eugene Henry Walter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Albert Curtis Wells, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Russell Melroy Miner, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. John Nevin Howell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Mason Kemper, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Maynard Denzil Pedersen, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Thomas Wildes, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Alfred Ashman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Aaron Warner Tyer, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. James Dyce Alger, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Franklin Bell Reybold, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Ewing Chase Johnson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Robert Monroe Hardy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Pennock Hoyt Wollaston, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. German Pierce Culver, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Carl Theodore Isham, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Francis Mark McGoldrick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Wilhelm Cunliffe Freudenthal, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. John Alfrey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Joseph Riebler Russ, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Henry Dilley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Kermit Richard Schweidel, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Eugene Charles Orth, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Thomas Duncan Gillis, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Autrey Joseph Maroun, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Milton Clay Taylor, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Robert Morris, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Joseph Cobb Stancock, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Brown Morgan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. William Robert Murrin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Joseph Henry Wlechmann, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Foster Rhoades, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Richard Carlton Boys, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. George Robert Oglesby, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. John Calvin Stapleton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. William Vincent Martz, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Robert Edward Frith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Norman Arvid Skinrood, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Noel Maurice Cox, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Joseph Crook Anderson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. John Hart Caughey, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Henry Thomas Cherry, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. LeRoy William Austin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Charles Jordan Daly, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Edgar Joseph Treacy, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Paul Montgomery Jones, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Reuben Henry Tucker 3d, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. William Genier Proctor, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Lamont Saxton, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Caesar Frank Fiore, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Elmer Hardie Walker, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Clair Beverly Mitchell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. John Williamson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Pearson Sherden, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Charles Phelps Walker, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Louis Duzzette Farnsworth, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Charles Joseph Hoy, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Vernon Price Mock, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Allen Beall, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Orin Houston Moore, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Donald William Bernier, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Harvey Bower, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Allen Harvey Foreman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Floyd Garfield Pratt, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Glenn Cole, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Edward William Sawyer, Cavalry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. William Bradford Means, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. John Eldell Slaughter, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Robert Gibson Sherrard, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Andrew Jackson Boyle, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Stephen Disbrow Cocheu, Infantry (temporary major).
- First Lt. John Neiger, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Thomas Joseph Gent, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Albert Ambrose Matyas, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Benjamin Walker Hawes, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Benjamin White Heckemeyer, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. Nassieb George Bassitt, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
- First Lt. Ducat McEntee, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- First Lt. William Robert Patterson, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
- First Lt. Oscar Rawles Bowyer, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.



First Lt. John James Davis, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Norman Basil Edwards, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Pelham Davis Glassford, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Robert Eugene Tucker, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Robert Hollis Strauss, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Maurice Monroe Simons, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Alfred Kirk duMoulin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Walter Edward Bare, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Ralph Shaffer Harper, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Paul James Bryer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Raymond Clarence Adkisson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Burnis Mayo Kelly, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Lester Lewes Wheeler, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Carmon Ambrose Rogers, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Russell Batch Smith, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Marcus Samuel Griffin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. James George Balluff, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Richard Hayden Agnew, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. John Leroy Thomas, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. George Brendan O'Connor, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 First Lt. Russell Lynn Hawkins, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Eric Per Ramee, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Edwin Hood Ferris, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Jack Roberts, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Robert Middleton Booth, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. George Madison Jones, Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. James Louis McGehee, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. William Graham Barnwell, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).  
 First Lt. Walter Albert Riemenschneider, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. William Pierce O'Neal, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).  
 First Lt. George Place Hill, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Melville Brown Coburn, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. Alvin Louis Mente, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lt. David Bonesteel Stone, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Roland Joseph Rutte, Infantry (temporary captain).  
 First Lt. Glenn Curtis Thompson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Samuel Barcus Knowles, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. James Baird Buck, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Ralph Osborn Lashley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Thomas Robert Clarkin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. John Pope Blackshear, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

*To be captains with rank from June 30, 1945*

First Lt. Ray Willard Clifton, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Randolph Lowry Wood, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Arnold Theodore Johnson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Marvin Frederick Stalder, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Noel Francis Parrish, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Dolf Edward Muehleisen, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Carl Swyter, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Richard Cole Weller, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Edward Morris Gavin, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Robert Edward Jarmon, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Harry Crutcher, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Frank Neff Moyers, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Joseph Bynum Stanley, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Clarence Morice Sartain, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. James Hughes Price, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Joseph Caruthers Moore, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Lawrence Scott Fulwider, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Lester Standford Harris, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Donald Newman Wackwitz, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Charles Henry Leitner, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Clair Lawrence Wood, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Charles Bennett Harvin, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. George Henry Macintyre, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Bob Arnold, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Burton Wilnot Armstrong, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Harold Lee Neely, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Erickson Snowden Nichols, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Jasper Newton Bell, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Russell Lee Waldron, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. William Foster Day, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Harry Coursey, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 First Lt. Daniel Edwin Hooks, Air Corps (temporary colonel).  
 First Lt. Raymond Patten Todd, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

#### IN THE NAVY

Capt. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of September 1943.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 6th day of June 1945:

Frank Charles Anderson  
 James Einar Anderson  
 William DeForest Ball, Jr.  
 William Raymond Banks  
 Winford Welborn Barrow  
 John Joseph Barry  
 Glenn Carroll Bartoo

Donald Joseph Benolken  
 Charles William Berkman  
 Hobart Millard Bird  
 Meindert Peter Boon  
 Gerald Graham Brown, Jr.  
 Samuel Thomas Brown, Jr.  
 William Charles Brown  
 Mario Joseph Cataffo  
 Philip Norman Chance  
 Christopher Stephen Changaris  
 Douglas Hoyt Clifton  
 William Jacob Cloues II  
 Hubert Wilbur Cocklin  
 James Arthur Dillian  
 William George Donaldson  
 Morgan Lee Dring  
 William Davidson Ebright  
 Martin William Flesch  
 James Alexander Ford  
 David Daniel Fritts  
 Walter Richard Goat  
 Leslie MacLachlan Greig  
 Ralph Eldon Grosjean  
 William Allen Gross, Jr.  
 Robert Raymond Hagan, Jr.  
 Carl Finley Hanna, Jr.  
 Paul Anthony Hansen  
 Oliver Willard Harrison  
 Bruce Donald Hartel  
 Robert Joseph Healy  
 James Charles Heffernan  
 Spencer Maltby Higley  
 Philip Merrill Hildebrandt  
 James Joseph Hill, Jr.  
 Clarence Richard Howard  
 James Richard Iversen  
 Robert Leslie Kallin  
 Harry James Kolkebeck  
 Frederic Newcomb Lattin  
 Sam Anthony Lombardo  
 Robert Burney Long, Jr.  
 Charles William Lotz  
 Herbert James Lynch  
 Jack Drage Lyon  
 Jesse Gilbert Magee, Jr.  
 Risto Antero Mattila  
 Eugene Edward McCrory  
 Edward Perry McMahon  
 Julian Paul Mendelsohn  
 George William Miller  
 Mark Fowlkes Mitchell  
 James Hamilton Bates Morton  
 Kevin Leo Moser  
 Laurence Milton Newkirk  
 Ralph Winge Niesz  
 Charles Husler Nixon  
 John Paul Obarski  
 Joseph Brian O'Hara  
 Allen Childress Pearce  
 Clifford Francis Peistrup  
 David Claflin Porter  
 Robert Ira Price  
 Robert Naylor Rea  
 George Thomas Richardson  
 Edgar Clark Ritchie  
 Casimir Stephen Rcjjeski  
 David Robertson Rondstedt  
 Stanley Bruce Russell  
 William Oscar Schach  
 Norman Lee Scherer  
 Stanley Schilling  
 Jack Wilbur Schwarze  
 Robert George Schwing  
 Willis Neil Seehorn  
 Abe Harold Siemens  
 Reuel Floyd Stratton  
 Peter Alexander Thistle  
 Francis Andrew Tubeck  
 Donald Eugene Ullery  
 Carl William Vogelsang, Jr.  
 David Carl Walker  
 Alvin Norman Ward  
 Paul William Welker  
 Marc Welliver II  
 Robert Erving Williams  
 Leslie John Williamsen  
 Francis Calvin Wilson  
 James MacQuaid Wilson  
 Robert Douglas Winship  
 Robert Arnold Worsing

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24, 1945:

## IN THE NAVY

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be an admiral

Richmond K. Turner

To be rear admirals

Dixwell Ketcham  
Houston L. Maples  
William M. Callaghan  
William N. Thomas

To be commodores

James E. Boak	William S. Popham
Merrill Comstock	Dennis L. Ryan
Charles F. Martin	Dixie Kiefer
James E. Maher	George C. Crawford

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

## APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be major generals

Thomas E. Bourke  
LeRoy P. Hunt

To be brigadier generals

Joseph T. Smith  
Andrew E. Creesy  
Evans O. Ames

## POSTMASTERS

## ARKANSAS

Corynne Warren, Brickeys.

## OHIO

Viola Smathers, Buchtel.  
Anna M. Krug, Spring Valley.

## OKLAHOMA

Henry R. Hare, Keota.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, who art ever standing with outstretched arms waiting to welcome us to Thyself, at this noon hour of another beautiful day, we are again coming unto Thee with many needs.

We pray that our sinful hearts may be cleansed by Thy forgiving love; may our troubled and restless minds be quieted by Thy peace; may our insurgent and inordinate impulses be rebuked and restrained by the divine holiness of our blessed Lord; may our proud and haughty spirits be disciplined by His humility and obedience; may our selfish and ambitious wills be transformed by the remembrance of His sufferings and sacrifices.

Grant that during these days of strain and stress our President and all the chosen leaders and representatives of our beloved country may have Thy wisdom to guide them in the affairs of government and Thy love to cheer them. May all the barriers of misunderstanding and suspicion in the realm of international relationships be broken down and may men and nations be led by Thy spirit to find the way of peace and good will.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## ENLISTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2388) to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "reenlistment", insert "": *Provided*, That the number of original enlistments or reenlistments in force pursuant to this act shall not exceed the total enlisted peacetime strength of the Regular Army now or hereafter authorized by law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the bill H. R. 3240, and to include certain tables, excerpts, and other material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON AS SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know all the Members of the House were proud to read and to hear yesterday of the appointment of one of our distinguished Members of the House the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] as Secretary of Agriculture.

The House, I know, is pleased with the selection of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] by President Truman. I know that all Members of the House will join with me in expressing our congratulations to the President in his choice of the gentleman from New Mexico, and also in extending to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] our sincere congratulations and our best wishes for the greatest success possible in his new responsible position and of our assurances of cooperation with him in carrying out his plans and his policies and his programs, which we know will be for the best interest of our country.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the New York Post.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include correspondence between Mr. R. B. Creager and Mr. Roy Miller.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal, May 17, entitled "Action on Trade Pacts."

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico (at the request of Mr. SIKES) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include certain material.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the effects of trade agreements on industries in Rhode Island, and include certain tables.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a joint statement signed by Democratic Members of the Michigan delegation relative to our views as to the present industrial situation in Michigan in its relation to the war and reconversion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a short article entitled "WLB Reconversion Wage Policy," which appeared in the May edition of the Research Report issued by the International Research Department, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America—UAW-CIO.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a brief article written by a former Member of the House, the Honorable Sam B. Pettengill, of Indiana. The article is entitled "Poland," and has appeared in approximately 60 newspapers in this country. It is one of the most concise and fair releases I have read on the Polish-Russian situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in five instances and include excerpts from newspapers and letters.